NORTH AMERICAN REVIEW

No. DCXXXVI.

NOVEMBER, 1908.

PARTY GOVERNMENT.

BY GOLDWIN SMITH, D.C.L.

THE general elections are coming on at once in the United States and in Canada—in both cases under pretty normal conditions, without any engrossing issue. In Canada, there is a struggle against political corruption, "graft," as the people call it, but this is a subject on which all the world is, or professes to be, of one mind. In some quarters in Canada there is a desire to put a limit to French and Catholic headship of the State, which shows itself, as it signally did in enforcing the system of separate schools on the Northwest, an instrument of Papal domination. This also, however, may be almost regarded as a normal issue. Nor, in the case of the United States, is any division on a vital question discernible by an onlooker. Nothing of the kind certainly is deducible from the party names, one of which is Greek and the other Latin for the same thing. In Canada, the party names are "Conservative" and "Liberal"; but no one could easily tell what is now the political meaning of either. The original line of division was a survival, fast fading, of that between the United Empire Loyalists and the authors of the Revolution of 1837. The present Premier, Sir Wilfrid Laurier, went into power a decided free-trader; but it soon became pretty apparent that, to use his own phrase of the other day, he was

Copyright, 1908, by THE NORTH AMERICAN REVIEW PUBLISHING COMPANY All Rights Reserved

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

holding "a heart-to-heart conference with his friends the manufacturers," one of whom expressed his wish, not long ago, to build between Canada and the United States a tariff wall as high as Haman's gallows. I once at a farmers' picnic took aside one of the company, who was evidently an intelligent man, and asked him what was the real difference between his party and the other party. After a long pause came the answer: "We say the other fellows are corrupt."

Parties, of course, there will be in all free communities as often as differences of opinion on vital questions arise, and the engrossing importance of the vital issue of the day will constrain men on both sides to suppress for the time their differences of opinion on questions of less importance. Parties in this sense there were at Athens, at Rome, in Mediæval Italy, in France, in Holland; in all countries, in fact, where political sentiment has been free. But hardly any nation except England and her political offshoots can be said to have recognized as the normal system of government the party system based on a formal and permanent division of the people into two political sections, with standing party names, in one of which every active citizen is expected to enroll himself and remain, on penalty, if he deserts, of being deemed a political apostate. Not that party is recognized in the constitutions. Washington deprecated it, and tried to nip it in the bud by putting Hamilton and Jefferson together in his Cabinet. In England, parties of the most pronounced and militant kind were formed by the struggle for political freedom against the Stuarts; though they presently broke into sections, moderate and extreme. The struggle against the Stuarts ended only with the defeat of the last Pretender at Culloden, up to which time it had continued, forming not so much an application of the party system of government as the sequel to a civil war. After that date, the parties broke up, leaving only the nicknames "Tory" and "Whig" as vague designations of tendencies, monarchical or popular, and really very much lost in the struggle of the aristocratic leaders of "Connections" who wrestled and intrigued against each other for place and pelf, while the Crown strove, with the help of some parasitic adherents, to liberate its power from the encroachments of them all; Chatham alone trying to make government national with himself as dictator.

In this political era it was that Burke wrote the well-known

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

paragraph which has been taken as a definition of party and a vindication of the party system:

"Party is a body of men united, for promoting by their joint endeavors the national interest, upon some particular principle in which they are all agreed. For my part, I find it impossible to conceive that any one believes in his own politics, or thinks them to be of any weight, who refuses to adopt the means of having them reduced into practice. It is the business of the speculative philosopher to mark the proper ends of government. It is the business of the politician, who is the philosopher in action, to find out proper means toward those ends, and to employ them with effect. Therefore, every honorable connection will avow it is their first purpose, to pursue every just method to put the men who hold their opinions into such a condition as may enable them to carry their common plans into execution, with all the power and authority of the state. As this power is attached to certain situations, it is their duty to contend for these situations. Without a proscription of others, they are bound to give to their own party the preference in all things; and by no means, for private considerations, to accept any offers of power in which the whole body is not included; nor to suffer themselves to be led, or to be controlled, or to be overbalanced, in office or in council, by those who contradict the very fundamental principles on which their party is formed, and even those upon which every fair connection must stand. Such a generous contention for power, on such manly and honorable maxims, will easily be distinguished from the mean and interested struggle for place and emolument. The very style of such persons will serve to discriminate them from those numberless impostors, who have deluded the ignorant with professions incompatible with human practice, and have afterwards incensed them by practices below the level of vulgar rectitude."*

Burke, as the attentive student of his writings, much more of his course as a statesman, will presently find, while he was a consummate master of language and perhaps of political philosophy in general, was not a practical politician or trustworthy as a political teacher. Few things, indeed, more untrustworthy or more mischievous in their effect have ever been written than his essay, eloquent as it is, on the French Revolution, which took the country by storm and defeated the salutary efforts of Pitt and his colleagues to keep England clear of the raging conflagration. However, that which Burke has before his mind, called "party," is not the system of party government, as we understand and work it, but a "Connection" such as that of which his own patron, the Marquis of Rockingham, was the head,

* Burke, "Thoughts on the Cause of the Present Discontents."

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

and which struggled, on one hand, against the Monarchy and the courtiers, who were striving to make the power of the Crown supreme and put all the Connections, which they stigmatized as "Party," under its feet. He looked with jealous eyes also on Chatham's national dictatorship, which would have crushed and superseded the Connections. What does he mean by a "particular principle"? He can hardly mean a general principle of political morality or expediency. A perpetual division on one of these there can hardly be. He must mean some definite question of politics, which being settled, the necessity and the justification for party must apparently end.

Pitt's sweeping victory over Fox and North was largely personal, and for the time almost annulled party. Then came the reaction against the French Revolution and a number of secessions, including that of Burke himself, from the ranks called "Whig" to the ranks called "Tory." In fact, there was a complete ascendency of Pitt and his anti-revolutionary following, with an Opposition oratorically strong but numerically insignificant, so much so that at one time it took to the hopeless course of protesting by secession. This is hardly an illustration of party government.

The French Revolution over, the tide in England set the other way, till it reached the flood in the passing of the Reform Bill, with a train of other progressive measures. Then followed a real division into parties under the qualified names of "Conservative" and "Liberal," with a pretty equal division of forces. The idea of government by party as a system may be said perhaps now to have clearly presented itself for the first time. It presently betrayed its spirit in the intrigue which ejected from the headship of the Government Peel, incomparably our best administrator, and this at the time of the Irish Famine, when there was most need of his administrative skill. By the Protectionists, from whom he had conscientiously parted, he was everywhere fiercely branded as a traitor. The conspiracy against him was got up by a political adventurer who denied in the debate that he had ever asked Peel for office, but is now by the publication of Peel's correspondence proved to have asked for office in the most adulatory terms.

Since that time, amidst all the shufflings of the cards, temporary coalitions, and the personal rivalries connected with the

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

names of Palmerston, Russell, Aberdeen, Gladstone, the idea of government by party has certainly continued to prevail, and public men have felt themselves bound to respect the party tie and to apologize if they broke it. Graham suffered unjustly for his disregard of it, which was falsely ascribed to his personal ambition, though it now appears clearly to have been the dictate of his conscience. Perhaps of all those men he was worthiest to rule. The career of Gladstone, however, with its extraordinary transformations, shows that in moving times, where either ambition or conscience is strong, allegiance to party is not easily preserved. The mechanical arrangement of the House of Commons, divided into two down the middle, has probably not been without its effect in shaping the form and determining the course of English politics. It takes a moral effort to cross the House.

The system, of course, demands great repression of individual opinion, a thing evidently undesirable in any deliberative assembly. It exacts not only repression of opinion, but often active support, and sometimes even advocacy, of measures to which the voter is personally not inclined. Gladstone's second Home Rule Bill gave Ireland, not only a Parliament of her own, but a delegated representation in the British Parliament, to play upon the balance of parties in it and keep it in subserviency to the game of the Irish politicians. It was hardly possible that the bulk of the Gladstone party in the House of Commons should have voted conscientiously for that Bill. Gladstone had been at first and for long the most vehement opponent of Home Rule, had thrown its leaders into prison, had denounced it as leading to the disruption of the Kingdom, had proclaimed the arrest of Parnell amidst the greatest enthusiasm to a shouting multitude at Guildhall. But the Irish members, playing their own game, had at the general election voted for his opponents; he must have seen that the Conservatives were coquetting with them, and that the party situation and his continuance in power could be saved only at the expense of the integrity of the United Kingdom. He may have reckoned on the Lords to throw out the Bill, and felt sure that they would be supported by the country. So, unquestionably, did not a few of his supporters. But Home Rule, though thrown out by an overwhelming majority in the Lords, was not killed and the integrity of the United Kingdom is in jeopardy at this hour.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

In British Canada, the first political parties were formed in the struggle for political power and pelf between the Family Compact—that is, the group of families representing the exiles of the American Revolution, who were naturally strong Tories, and the later comers. In French Canada, now Quebec, the parties were formed by the struggle for power and pelf between the oligarchy of British invaders and the French-Canadian population. The connection between the two risings, that in British and that in French Canada, was only sympathetic at the time and soon gave place to the antagonism of race. Both risings failed in the field, but the political objects of both were practically secured to them by the ascendency of the Liberal Party in England consequent on the carrying of the Reform Bill. The expectation of Lord Durham that the French Province would be Anglicized was totally belied. The French Province remains largely a separate element in Canadian politics, the more so because it is under the temporal power of the Papacy, displayed the other day in forcing, by the hand of a Roman Catholic Premier, the system of Separate Schools in the Papal interest on the Northwest. The result was a series of shifting combinations and intrigues. In the end, there was a deadlock, neither party being able to secure a majority. Out of the deadlock an escape was sought in a confederation of the British North American colonies; with success so far as putting an end to the paralyzing balance between Upper and Lower Canada was concerned, though another difficulty was raised by geographical position, the line of Provinces stretching across the continent with wide intervals between them being unpropitious to perfect union. We in Canada have just had going on a party struggle for place, angry enough. What the parties to it were it would not have been easy to say. The party in power styled itself Liberal, while its rival styled itself Conservative. The party which styled itself Liberal before it got power was for free trade and reform of the Senate; both in the most pronounced and fervent way. But it had wriggled out of both those professions; while it was difficult to say what constituted the other party conservative, and its protectionism, though no doubt sincere, had for the time been rather hid under a bushel. Special interests and personalities really played the chief part. There was a strong popular feeling against corruption, but this is not a party

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

cry nor is its organ the local association or the caucus. The battle will be decided by the time this paper appears. The caucus, Parliamentary and local, morally rules. When an honest and independent member of Parliament rebels, the two local bosses combine to throw him out of his seat, and the head of the party approves what they have done.

In the United States, a foundation, only too natural and sure, for party was found in slavery, which from the outset, in fact, made the States styled "united" morally two nationalities in uneasy union. The rupture was sure to come. By some friends of the North in England it was felt to be so inevitable that they at first hung back; though, when the war was actually on foot, they could not hesitate in taking their side and doing all in their power to counteract the efforts of the aristocratic or ultra-mercantile sections which sympathized with the South. It is curious to trace the sequences of events in history, such as that which was brought to our notice the other day by the celebration of the British conquest of Quebec. Quebec was taken by the British to relieve New England of the fear of France. It did relieve New England of the fear of France; and, at the same time, as shrewd observers foresaw, of the fear of the British Government. The colonial war ensued. Into that war France rushed for revenge. Her financial difficulty, which before, though great, had not been past remedy by a Colbert or a Turgot, was thereby brought to a crisis, and the Government was thereby compelled to call the States General, thereby bringing on the Revolution. Nor does the chain of traceable causation end here. In England, the movement in favor of the abolition of slavery had been set on foot, with the young Pitt and Wilberforce among its coming champions, and with a moral certainty of success, which would have been earlier achieved but for the recoil from the French Revolution. The colonies, apparently, had they stayed a little longer with the Mother Country, would have shared emancipation. Blessed are the peace-makers, more blessed sometimes even than they may think.

The anti-slavery and negrophilist leaders in the United States, Charles Sumner especially, were impetuous, and their passions had been kindled by the war. They might otherwise have refrained from investing the negro at once with political power, to the use of which he was absolutely a stranger, and thus bringing

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

on Carpet-bagging, the Ku Klux, and in some measure this unhappy and ominous state of things. I conversed some time ago in the South with a very intelligent negro, the keeper of a light-house. He avowed his belief that his race would have been contented with a grant of personal freedom and equal justice, and would have at all events waited patiently for political power.

The issue is difficult to foresee. It is difficult to believe that these periodical affrays, in the midst of one of which this is written, with all their trickery, mutual abuse and corruption, are destined forever to be the mode of framing the Government and securing loyalty to it when it is framed. The incongruity will be the more manifest and noxious if the Church should lose its hold and the importance and sacredness of the State should thereby increase.

The United States are being filled with aliens to whom American institutions and ideas are strange, while the native race is not prolific. Public schools may improve the intelligence, but they cannot at once change the character. In the womb of the future there may be forming forces which by sheer necessity will compel you to put government above party.

A force, in fact, in England at least, is visibly forming which must apparently be fatal to the system. When it was a question between the Stuarts and Hanoverians—that is, between despotism and a free constitution—to preserve party unanimity and discipline was not so difficult. But those days are not ours. In England, the House of Commons is still divided down the middle in conformity with the party hypothesis; but on both sets of benches there is diversity of opinion; on the Liberal side not only diversity, but positive contradiction. The party called "Liberal," on which the present Government rests, is made up, in fact, of five sections with wide differences of opinion and object; Liberals, Radicals, Labor men, Socialists and Home-Rulers. The Labor men and Socialists have to be kept on terms with a very moderate Liberal such as Sir Edward Grey. The Opposition meanwhile plays its appointed part by doing all that it can to embarrass the Government. The consequence is that an extreme section of the other side can, by playing on the balance of party, control the action of the Government and thereby force its own policy. England is now in danger from this source. I learn on the best authority that the Home Rule question is on the eve of settle-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

ment. Pressed by the Home Rule party on the weakness of the Government it can hardly fail to be a settlement dangerous to the unity of the nation.

Opinion, political and social, is increasingly active. New sects, female suffragism among them, are being formed and presenting themselves in the political arena. With these the two regular parties will have to reckon. A curious tessellation of objects and creeds is likely to result. The difficulty will hardly be met by dividing the House into two sets of benches with a gangway between them.

Not only in England but in the United States this process of disintegration of party by the formation of sectional combinations appears to be going on. The Temperance party, the Labor party, and the Female Suffrage party, seem to be forming in force outside the regular parties of Republicans and Democrats; they will probably soon learn the trick of playing on the balance. When they do, and thus acquire a power of passing minority measures as the Irish party, and, it may probably be said also, the Old-age Pensions party, has been doing in England, it will apparently become time for American statesmen to set their wits to work on the creation of something to come in the place of party government.

GOLDWIN SMITH.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

THE WOMAN MOVEMENT IN ENGLAND.

BY THE REV. CHARLES F. AKED, D.D.

THREE years ago, Great Britain was startled by the appearance on the political horizon of a new army of men bent on shifting the ground of battle. Thirty Members were returned to Parliament independently of the old political parties, breathing out threatenings and slaughter indeed against them both. Up to the hour of their appearance, Liberals and Tories had held undisputed possession of the field; undisputed, that is, save for the terrible Irish with their hands against every hand that grasps power in the realm. In the presence of this new force, men and editors stood aghast. The country breathed heavily as it looked upon so strange an evidence of the awakening of democracy, grew first alarmed, then fretful, and finally settled down to face the inevitable—the task of satisfying the demands of an aroused people whose banner-bearers these thirty were. Timorous souls the world over, asking what these things might portend, whispered the fateful word "Revolution!" And timorous souls were so far right that the legislative enactments of the last three years, not to speak of proposals which are still in the air, do unquestionably indicate that a revolution is in progress in Great Britain, a change radical and complete in the national point of view.

Side by side with this remarkable emergence of the dumb, inarticulate masses of the people into independent and aggressive political action has proceeded another movement, in some respects more remarkable still. It is the movement for the political emancipation of women. The juxtaposition of the two and their contemporary progress must not be regarded as a mere coincidence. Historically the workman and the woman have been alike the objects of exploitation. But the case of the woman has been worse than that of the man. The charge which Professor Thorold

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Rogers, the historian of the economic development of the English people, brings against the legislation of centuries dead and gone might be preferred with little substantial change in justification of the clamant demands of women:

"I contend that from 1563 to 1824 a conspiracy concocted by the law and carried out by parties interested in its success was entered into to cheat the English workman of his wages, to tie him to the soil, to deprive him of hope and to degrade him into irremediable poverty. . . . For more than two centuries and a half the English law and those who administered the law were engaged in grinding the English workman down to the lowest pittance, in stamping out any expression or act which seemed to indicate organized discontent, and in multiplying penalties upon him when he thought of his natural rights."

If the destruction of the poor has been their poverty, according to the Hebrew proverb, the weakness of the woman has been her womanhood. Equally as a woman and as a worker she has been exploited: equally as a woman and as a worker she has come to feel the need of the vote to protect her womanhood and secure to herself the fruits of her toil. The power of the ballot is for the woman as well as for the man. The realization of its value by the working-man could only issue in a demand for it by the woman. In the course of man's struggle for economic liberty women have learned the value of political enfranchisement.

To be sure, the women of Great Britain do not stand alone. In every civilized country of the world, and in some that are not civilized, the "Woman Movement" is upon us. In America, the professions are open to women as to men. In four States, Colorado, Wyoming, Idaho and Utah, women possess the ballot. In New Zealand and some of the Australian States, women may vote. The women of Finland are eligible for a seat in their National Assembly, and twenty-five women have been elected to the present Parliament. Germany has just taken an important step toward granting equal educational privileges to its women in allowing them to enter its universities. The women of Norway are citizens. And so the story goes. The women of the harem are throwing off their veils, and the spirit that moves them is the spirit of the British Suffragists.

In their demand for the ballot, the women of Great Britain take ground common to the Suffragists of all countries. But the British movement has characteristics peculiarly its own. In the long

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

centuries of history in which it has its roots, in the enormous suffrage rights already possessed which it is intended to safeguard, in the volume of opinion by which it is sustained, and in the militant, devoted methods by which it has commanded the attention of the Imperial Government and of the world, the British movement is unique. And these special characteristics it is the purpose of the following pages to make clear.

The Woman Suffragists of Great Britain declare that they are not asking for something new in the life of their country. They claim the restitution of a right which, they assert, was possessed throughout the centuries, of which they allege they were deprived by the legislature as late as the year 1832. This alone differentiates the claim of the British Suffragists from that of their sisters in America. They admit that the suffrage was rarely exercised in those old days, and they are ready with an explanation as to why the power they now anxiously covet was suffered to fall into disuse. It is only recently that the power of the ballot has been understood. So far from its being regarded as a right and an instrument of self-protection, it was thought of as the performance of a duty involving great expense and trouble. The dangers of the journey were great. Travel was difficult. Roads were not safe. The number of those qualified to vote was necessarily very small. Organization, of course, had not been heard of, and, generally, the surprising thing would have been if the exercise of the franchise by women had been other than a rare and isolated phenomenon. Prior to 1832, the total electorate of Great Britain was not more than 700,000. The property qualification was formidable. As the property of women passed upon marriage to their husbands, those qualified for voting lost their qualification as soon as they left single life behind them. Obviously, in so small an electorate there could be but few widows and spinsters possessed of the necessary property qualification; and the English advocates of Woman Suffrage profess no surprise that in the course of the centuries such women gradually allowed a disagreeable and dangerous duty to slip into the background.

The Parliamentary franchise is, of course, the goal of the Suffragists' ambition. The Municipal franchise appears to have been theirs from time immemorial, and, it is alleged, was from time to time exercised by them except for a period between 1832 and 1867, during which they were deprived of it by law. This legis-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

lative disfranchisement needs to be understood, for it is one of the several acts by Parliament and by the Courts tending to narrow the powers possessed by women, affording ground for fear that other attempts to curtail their rights will be made, and successfully made, unless the supreme power of the Parliamentary ballot can be utilized to safeguard the rest. In the Reform Act of 1832, the word "male" was used to qualify "persons." Nothing of the kind had ever been done by any statute. By this Act, women were legally disfranchised for the first time in the history of the British Constitution.

During the next great Reform agitation, the stormy times of 1867-8, efforts were made by the advocates of Woman Suffrage to secure Parliamentary recognition of their claim. In the Bill the word "man" was used, and it is curious to note that two amendments were defeated: one by John Stuart Mill that the Act should be made expressly to include women, and one with the contrary intention that the word "man" should go out and "male person" replace it. In the course of the discussion, Mr. Justice Denman, a judge of the Court of Common Pleas, asked the following question:

"Why, instead of the words 'male person' of the Act of 1832, the word 'man' had been substituted in the present Bill? In the fifth clause he found that after saying that every 'man' should be entitled to be registered, it proceeds to say, 'or a male person in any University who has passed any senior middle examination.' In the light of Lord Brougham's Act, if the Court of Queen's Bench had to decide to-morrow on the construction of these clauses, they would be constrained to hold that they conferred the suffrage on female persons as well as on males."

After the Bill became law, thousands of women succeeded in getting on the register as voters, and the matter had to be fought out in the Courts, with the result that the judges decided at last that women had no statutory right to be recognized as citizens, and that until such a right was expressly conferred by Act of Parliament they must remain outside the Parliamentary franchise. Meanwhile, they had succeeded in securing the restitution of the Municipal franchise of which they were deprived in 1832.

In 1888, County Councils were established throughout England, and, as there was nothing in the Act of Parliament which implied the disability of women otherwise qualified to stand for election, an attempt was made by two distinguished women, Miss

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Cobden and Lady Sandhurst, to gain seats on the London County Council. They were both elected. A defeated candidate, Mr. Beresford-Hope, took the matter into the Courts, and the Court of Appeal held that women were not eligible. Lord Esher, the presiding judge, said:

"I take it that neither by the Common Law nor by the Constitution of this country from the beginning of the Common Law until now can a woman be entitled to exercise any public function."

Yet at the very time Lord Esher spoke, it has been pertinently pointed out, women were acting as Overseers, Way-wardens, Church-wardens, Poor-Law Guardians and members of School Boards, which surely were public functions "within the meaning of the Act," and Lord Esher sat as judge by virtue of the authority of a female Sovereign! And all the time the words of Lord Brougham's Act stared him in the face: "That in all Acts words importing the masculine gender shall be deemed and taken to include females unless the contrary is expressly provided." The point of all this is, of course, to justify the contention of the Woman Suffragists of England that rights possessed by them under the Common Law and the Constitution have been filched from them by judge-made law, and that there is no security for rights of which they are still possessed except the ballot.

By the Local Government Act of 1894, another disability was imposed upon the voteless half of the community. Here it is a case of deprivation by the legislature and not by judges. The Bill provided that the Chairman of a District Council, "unless personally disqualified by any Act, shall be by virtue of his office a Justice of the Peace of the County in which the district is situated." A restrictive clause "unless a woman" was introduced, and women were robbed of a dignity which they had enjoyed certainly as far back as the reign of Queen Mary. Again, by the conversion in 1899 of the London Vestries into Borough Councils, women who were doing excellent work as members of the Vestries were turned out of office, for women were not eligible for membership of Borough Councils. Further, the Education Act of 1902, which converted the School Boards of the country into Education Committees of the Borough and County Councils, in like manner removed from office women who were successfully working in the interest of education. The Act allowed women to be "co-opted," but not elected.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

These are only specimens of a continuous process by which the ancient rights possessed by women have been taken from them. And they constitute a part of their case for the Parliamentary franchise. It is perfectly true that some of these privileges have been restored by the present Parliament. Last year, a Bill passed both Houses, empowering women to sit on Borough and County Councils, if possessed of the necessary property qualification and unmarried. The disability of the married woman still remains in England, though for some reason past finding out the married woman in London may now sit upon the County Council. In a word, unmarried women possessed of the qualifications which entitle men to vote may vote in every election in England other than a Parliamentary election, and may be elected to every governing body except the House of Commons. It may be suggested that the reference to the Act of 1907 proves too much; that it shows how a Parliament of men elected by men is ready to redress the disabilities imposed on women as soon as the inequalities are clearly perceived. The answer to it is that there is no reason in the world to suppose that Parliament would have moved hand or foot but for the tremendous pressure of the movement which we are now discussing. The agitation has already justified itself.

Behind the demand of the women for the suffrage, great masses of the British people are already ranged. Reckoned in bulk, there cannot be fewer than six millions of people pledged through their organizations to equal suffrage for men and women. These organizations include the "Co-operative Society" with two and a half millions of members, "The Labor Party" with almost as many, "The Women's Liberal Association," "The British Women's Temperance Association," "The Women's Textile Union," "The Women's Labor League," "The Social and Political Union," "The National Union of Women's Suffrage Societies," "The Men's League for Woman Suffrage" and many others. The work of some of these societies needs to be better understood.

"The National Union of Women's Suffrage Societies" is a federation of the Suffrage societies all over the country which work on purely constitutional lines. It is an organization which grew up out of the agitation of 1865 when John Stuart Mill introduced the first Woman Suffrage measure into the House of Commons. Its Executive is composed of women elected by the delegates from the different affiliated societies and represents all the political

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

parties. Mrs. Fawcett, widow of a Victorian Cabinet Minister of Liberal principles, Lady Frances Balfour, related to Mr. Arthur Balfour, the Conservative leader, and Mrs. Philip Snowden, wife of one of the Parliamentary leaders of the Labor Party, are members of this Executive and illustrations of the wide range of view embraced by the Suffrage Movement. The work of this Society is strictly confined within limits admitted to be constitutional and decorous. Its influence has been felt in every recent by-election.

"The Women's Social and Political Union" was founded three years ago in Manchester by Mrs. Pankhurst, widow of a distinguished barrister responsible more than any other man for the passing of the "Married Women's Property Act," and associated with the Labor Party as one of its most capable leaders. Mrs. Pankhurst found even this, the most advanced political party in the State, indifferent to the Woman's question, and out of her resentment of this indifference came "The Women's Social and Political Union." It is this Society which has made the Suffrage Movement famous—its critics would say notorious—throughout the world. Its policy is to oppose in every way the Government which is in power, in the hope of securing through the tactics of the importunate widow the importunate widow's reward. It has taken this line with uncompromising boldness, adhered to it with resistless tenacity, and in the pursuit of it manifested a courage which has no parallel in British history. It is this Society which is responsible for the processions, the interruptions of public meetings, the disturbances in and near the House of Parliament, and, generally, for the tactics which have given to the vocabulary a new word of offence, "Suffragette." The members of "The Women's Social and Political Union" justify their policy on the following grounds: There are six hundred and seventy Members of the House of Commons. Of these, four hundred and twenty are pledged to Woman Suffrage. The Bill before the House in the early part of the present year passed its second reading by a majority of three to one in its favor. The Liberal Party owes its return to power with such an overwhelming majority very largely to the efforts of women. The Liberal Party is supposed to be the progressive party of the country. It has never lowered the flag on which it once inscribed "Taxation without representation is robbery," nor has it bated jot or tittle of its claim that it stands always and everywhere for human liberty. At the begin-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

ning of the present Parliament, a monster deputation of representative women waited upon the late Sir Henry Campbell-Bannerman, then Prime Minister. Half a dozen speakers asked what the Liberal Government intended to do for women. The Prime Minister was himself strongly in favor of their demand, but his Cabinet contained men who were on the other side, and he was compelled to tell the women that they had nothing to hope for from his Government. The women chose to regard this as an invitation to them to declare war on the Government, and it has been war ever since. But it is only fair to them to remember that a majority of the Liberal leaders had pledged themselves before election to the suffrage, and to observe as well that there would have been no declaration of hostility had the Government promised to attempt something some time before it went out of office, even, that is to say, perhaps six years from the date of the deputation.

The women have learned the lessons of British history. Those lessons appear to teach that no political reform has ever been gained in England except through a show of force on the part of the disinherited demanding admission to citizenship. By force and passion political battles have been won. Parliaments do not legislate because there is need of legislation. Parliaments legislate where there is force to compel legislation! For fifty years women have been pleading, agitating softly, cooing their adversaries gently as a sucking dove, waiting like a pauper at the castle gate for the restitution of a right which once was theirs and for the grant of power which they have shown themselves capable of wielding wisely and well. They have seen Governments yield to men when the Hyde Park railings went down, and, having learned from their pastors and masters these rough methods, who is to blame them that they better their instruction? Wisdom is always justified of her children. And the Prime Minister of Great Britain has gone far to show how adroitly conceived is the women's policy. Mr. Asquith has been regarded as a bitter opponent of the women's cause. It was believed that he was the leader of the opposition in the Cabinet while Sir Henry Campbell-Bannerman was still Prime Minister. Because he can do no other he has yielded much. He has promised to accept an amendment to a Bill for an enlarged franchise which he proposes to introduce as the farewell act of a retiring Government, an amendment in favor of Woman Suffrage, on two conditions; first, that it shall

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

be sufficiently democratic, and, second, that it shall have been by that time shown that an overwhelming number of women desire the vote. And this concession, big with hope, is directly due to what the American public has been taught to regard as the outrageous and intolerable policy of the Suffragettes.

The situation can be summed up in a few words. Great Britain is looking upon a process of agitation and organization of which it would be impossible to overrate the significance. In a country where social distinctions are so marked as in England, the union of aristocrat, plutocrat and democrat in a demand for Woman Suffrage is itself amazing. Certain results are at the present moment undeniable. It is demonstrated that a vast number of the thinking women of the country want the vote. It is demonstrated that an enormous proportion of the philanthropic and, so to speak, devout women want the vote. It is demonstrated that overwhelming masses of the toiling women want the vote. It is not going too far to say, all respect paid to anti-suffragists of the name and fame and character of Mrs. Humphry Ward, that some of the best brains and best hearts of England want the vote for women. One does not desire to become dithyrambic in a calm discussion of a political movement, but it is simple fact that the zeal of the women is religious and that their courage has risen to heroism. They are possessed by the enthusiasm of humanity and they know the joy of sacrifice for a great cause. Woman has come to understand woman, and women have come to sympathize with women in a manner which itself marks the dawn of a new day. The power of politics to raise the status of women everywhere, to ameliorate distressful industrial and social conditions, and to open out large fields of social service is realized by them now too clearly for them ever to recede from the position they have taken. And some day they will arrive.

CHARLES F. AKED.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

RECENT CONGRESS OF THE INTERNATIONAL COUNCIL OF WOMEN.

BY IDA HUSTED HARPER.

EXACTLY forty years ago the first Woman's Club electrified the world by coming into existence and, very appropriately, in New York, the usual centre for startling events. The club called itself Sorosis—a bouquet of flowers—also very appropriately—for it burst into bloom in the dreary desert of woman's clubless life, and its seeds were scattered to the four corners of the earth. The harvest is seen in the International Council of Women, whose Congress has just closed in Geneva, and which represents so many million clubwomen that nobody has been able to count them accurately. There was no limit to the silly and shallow criticisms of Sorosis, to the dreadful predictions of its demoralizing effect on women and all that they typified. Now, with some of its founders still living, the world accepts without the slightest ridicule or censure this vast International Council made up of organizations of women in twenty-three countries. Its representatives have been received by Queens, Empresses, Presidents and Governments, and its proceedings have been telegraphed to the press of all countries. Geneva, not to be outdone by any other city, placed at the service of the recent Congress the ancient Hôtel de Ville, which for four centuries has been the seat of its government, whether kingdom, bishopric or republic. Only once before, at the anniversary of the founding of the Red Cross in that city, was it ever granted for any public purpose. Further, to show their hospitality, Canton and city united in a large reception to the Council delegates in Palais Eynard, where an official representative of the municipality expressed approval of their aims and wishes for their success.

And what are those aims which are now so universally sanc-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

tioned? They are measures so radical and revolutionary that, if they had even been mentioned to Sorosis twoscore years ago, it would have shrivelled up and faded away. When the Council was organized in Washington in 1888, with those intrepid path-breakers, Elizabeth Cady Stanton and Susan B. Anthony at its foundation, the first clause in its constitution guaranteed that no organization which affiliated with it should have its own independence or objects interfered with, or be committed to any principle, utterance or act of the international body which it did not approve. This was to be composed of National Councils which should be formed by federating the various societies of women in each country, and no line of work could be taken up officially which did not have the unanimous approval of these Councils. Those who predicted they could never agree on any one movement did not know the solidarity of women's interests throughout the world. It was not long before all united in a desire to strive for peace and arbitration between nations, and this has been done by the Council for the past fifteen years. The proposal that it should work to promote social purity and destroy the white-slave traffic did not meet with a dissenting voice, and this is now one of its strong departments. Investigation and improvement of the legal position of women soon was added. In 1904 came the crucial test, and at the great meeting in Berlin, by unanimous vote of the nineteen countries which then constituted the Council, suffrage and the rights of citizenship were put in charge of a department of international work and a standing committee formed to direct it. This is the most progressive movement yet made by the Council, and it grows larger every year. It is the earnest desire of the president, the Countess of Aberdeen, that public health shall be made a department of work, and that women everywhere shall be enlisted in organized effort to improve sanitary conditions, prevent the spread of contagious diseases, reduce infant mortality and concern themselves with every phase of this important question. This is already being done by the Councils of several countries.

Each nation is entitled to the same number of delegates, although the number of members varies widely. The United States Council represents many hundred thousand women. That of Great Britain is composed of four hundred and twenty-six organizations with an immense membership. France has about

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

seventy-five thousand members. Even so sparsely settled a country as Sweden has nearly twenty-five thousand. Switzerland has sixty-four organizations in her Council; the Netherlands, thirty-five; Austria, fifty. The Council is strong in Italy, and its recent Congress of Women attracted the attention of all Europe and was most favorably treated by the Italian press. Hungary, which one scarcely associates with progressive movements of women, has a Council of eighteen active organizations. In far-off Australia, the Councils in the various States are composed of from twenty-five to forty affiliated societies, and the wife of the new Governor-General is an enthusiastic Council worker. Argentina has a Council of Women which has now had a useful existence of fourteen years, and its varied departments of work are considered of so much value that the Government has made it an appropriation of $5,000 a year. At this Congress in Geneva, Bulgaria and Greece were received into the International Council. The latter has only three societies of women, but it is the desire of the Queen that they shall know the women of other countries through this affiliation, and she herself has accepted the presidency of the National Council of Greece.

It seems most pathetic that from women in Turkey should come inquiries as to whether they could possibly have any recognition. Russian women, who have many associations, have been endeavoring for a number of years to organize them into a Council, so that they might come into touch with those of the outside world by uniting with the International, but the Government absolutely forbids it. Prime-Minister Stolypin has granted them permission to hold their first Congress next December, but with the stipulation that they shall not form a National Council, as intercourse with other countries is the thing he most wishes to avoid. There were, however, several Russian women at this Geneva meeting, who in appearance, education and ability were the peers of any in attendance, and they were received with the warmest sympathy and friendliness. The treasurer of the International Council, Mrs. W. E. Sanford, of Ontario, Canada, recently made a tour around the world in its interest. In Bombay, Calcutta, Benares, Lucknow and other cities of India, she held meetings attended by the most prominent of the English and Indian women—the families of high officials, bishops, merchants, etc.—and all favored the organization of a National Council of

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Women in India if for no other reason than to draw those of the different religions together, and give them a common ground on which to form acquaintance and friendship. It is probable that this will be done in a short time. In Japan, Mrs. Sanford presented the question to members of the Royal Family and other ladies of influence who came together for the purpose. They seemed deeply interested and hoped for a Council in the future, but felt that it was entirely too forward a movement for the present.

At the Quinquennial of the International Council, which will be held in Toronto, Canada, the third and fourth weeks of next June, the public will be able to gain some idea of the actual work that is being done by these Councils, which it would not be possible to describe here. It covers every phase of social activity that is characteristic of the new century—educational, philanthropic, reformatory, ethical, religious, political. The Council of each country has its committees for the special departments of the international work, while every association belonging to it is also busy with its individual enterprises. There is not in the whole world another such body of organized workers. The Congress that will be held in connection with the Council in Toronto is to be divided into nine sections devoted to the topics mentioned above, and including also music, art and literature, with speakers for each who have made it a subject of special study and work. The buildings of the University have been granted for the occasion, and the public evening meetings will be held in its large new Congregation Hall. A prominent Toronto paper has for a long time placed two columns each week at the service of the Canadian Council. This has branches in the farthest outposts of its northwestern provinces, giving the women of the whole country a community of interests in a way that would be impossible for any other agency. Last year nearly one hundred eastern delegates travelled four thousand miles to attend the annual meeting in Vancouver, in order to become personally acquainted with the women of British Columbia and interest them in the coming Quinquennial. This meeting will also have the cordial assistance of the Council of the United States.

The deep injustice with which women are treated and the great necessity that they should co-operate to secure a recognition of their rights may be forcibly illustrated by the conditions in

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Switzerland, the "ideal republic." In only two of the twenty-five Cantons can a married woman collect or control her wages; in only two can she testify in court; in none has she equal guardianship with the husband over her children; the wife has almost no property rights and cannot dispose by will of her own real estate; wages paid to women are about two-thirds of those paid to men for the same work, and in many occupations are only one franc a day; the "age of consent" in most of the Cantons is thirteen; women are punished for prostitution, but men are not. Every man over twenty has a vote, not only for officials, but on all questions of legislation under the referendum, and they are eligible to all offices. No woman has a vote for any person or anything or is eligible for any office—not even to sit on any public board; nor have women a voice in any matters concerning the church or the right to fill any of its offices.

A few years ago, a Commission was appointed to revise the Civil Code, and a very strong effort was made by women to secure more equal laws, but they were not able to obtain any changes of consequence. This new code, which does not go into effect until 1912, will leave them legally where they were a hundred years ago. The Government ordered that a copy of this revised code should be sent to every voter, and the women, through their organizations, petitioned that a copy should be sent to every widow and unmarried woman. The answer came that the expense would be too great. The women then petitioned that five thousand might be set apart for women, and thus a few in each community could be supplied, but they were told that it was not considered worth while to spend any money in that way. And yet women had paid their full share of all the expenses connected with the preparing and distributing of this code.

Another significant instance was seen in regard to the Reformed Church. It has always been a State Institution, supported by public taxes of which women paid their quota. Some time ago the women of the Canton of Geneva concluded that, this being the case, it was time that they had a vote in Church matters. Under the leadership of the Woman's Union they collected two thousand signatures of women asking for this privilege and presented it to the Legislature. That body never paid the slightest attention to it. A few years later, the separation of Church and State was decided upon by this Canton, and a Commission of

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

nineteen prominent men appointed to prepare a new constitution for the Church. Being reminded by the women of this previous petition, they incorporated in it a vote for women in Church matters. When this was laid before the Legislature, the Woman's Union called a public meeting and a strong letter was adopted which spoke of women's long years of devotion to the Church, and asked for them a voice in its affairs. This was signed by forty of the most representative women in Geneva, and in twelve days an endorsement of it was signed by three thousand women, and the whole was sent to the Legislature. It could not be ignored; but the debate on it was of such an insulting character that the women were humiliated to the dust. The clause giving women a vote was struck out, and they were left without any rights whatever under the new régime. When it was found that it would be necessary to have thirty thousand dollars a year for the support of the Church besides its present income, these same men declared that the women could be depended on to raise a large part of this amount. Now they have sent a letter to each woman member, urging her to put forth every effort to collect this money.

This experience of Swiss women can be duplicated in every country in both hemispheres, and it is sending women by thousands into the various associations in order that they may have the strength of organized effort. The Council possesses the advantage over all others that it does not stand for any one propaganda, and those who disapprove of some of its branches of work may still take advantage of its co-operation to further the particular things they are striving for. Because of its wide scope, it can receive the recognition of potentates and governments who would shy at some of its departments—for instance, Peace, Temperance or Woman Suffrage. It is the most conspicuous example of democracy among women, who are apt to be rigid in maintaining the divisions of caste. The president of the International Council is the wife of an Earl; one of the vice-presidents is the wife of a French Cabinet Minister; another the wife of a Swedish professor; another the wife of a German music-teacher; one of the secretaries is herself a teacher; the treasurer owns and manages a large business. At this Geneva meeting, a Countess took the minutes; among the delegates were a number of Baronesses, Excellencies and Ladies, and sitting with them on a perfect

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

equality were women in all professions, many teachers and others who earn their own living. Among the costumes worn were some of the latest French creations and some of the "reform" style that had evidently been made at home, while ranging all the way between were as many modes as there were countries represented; but it may be truly said that the women did not think about their own clothes or their neighbors'. Even at the handsome receptions given by the Government and by the Swiss Council of Women, and at the beautiful garden parties, they seemed to be occupied chiefly with the questions that were before the Congress, and these things in themselves are an immense gain. Those who have been with the Council from the beginning have seen a wonderful increase of fraternal spirit among the delegates, of tolerance and self-control, of confidence and affection; a distinct lessening of provincialism, of looking upon one's own country, people and customs as superior to all others. Much of this harmony is due to the tact, courtesy and sweetness of Lady Aberdeen, who has held the presidency for ten years.

If this were an organization of men, what a power it would wield; how eagerly its opinions would be sought; what efforts would be made to secure its influence! When we contrast this vast association and its almost boundless work with the earliest inception of the club movement among women only forty years ago, is the hope not justified that within another twoscore years the opinions of women on the great questions of the day may be as highly valued as those of men, and their influence equally potent? Is it only a dream that the time will come when because of the International Council of Women universal peace shall be established and there shall never more be war between the nations of the earth?

IDA HUSTED HARPER.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

MATTHEW ARNOLD AS POET: TRIED BY HIS "SOHRAB AND RUSTUM."

BY PROFESSOR W. C. WILKINSON.

MANY years ago, attracted by a laudatory review of Matthew Arnold's poems, I sought delight in reading them. I failed to find what I sought. I blindly blamed my own want of insight, and, for a long time after, abode in that uncomfortable state of mind as to Arnold's verse. A simple incident at length occurred that led to a change in this mental attitude. I heard a brilliant university teacher of elocution, a man of more than the ordinary degree of culture for one in the line of his profession, read to an appreciative audience Arnold's chief long poem, his "Sohrab and Rustum." The poem was well rendered, but I listened, as also the reader seemed to me to read, with difficulty and labor. I was at a loss to account for this experience, and I took resort to a private perusal of the poem in quest of the reason. I found the reason in the character of the work itself. "Sohrab and Rustum" is not, in any high sense, a true poem. It lacks "inevitableness." It is a great effort and not a great poem. Arnold manifestly labored at it with conscientious exertion of his best powers, but he did not succeed in producing what he wished to produce—which I have understood to be a simple "objective" poem as free, as Homer's poetry is free, from the modern vice of self-consciousness and introspection. I shall not, however, criticise the work from the point of view of its failure to be Homeric, but from the point of view of its failure to be a well-conceived, well-executed treatment of a well-chosen theme for a narrative poem.

Perhaps it may be well enough to begin with the matter of Arnold's choice of theme. It is to be accounted great good fortune for a poet when he lights upon a happy theme for the employment of his powers. This good fortune did not befall

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Arnold when he decided on writing his "Sohrab and Rustum." The "fable" of the poem is supplied in a doubtful story belonging to the annals of Persia. Sohrab is the illegitimate son of Rustum, who abandoned the mother before her child was born. She found means afterwards to convey to the faithless father the false information that his offspring by her was a daughter instead of a son. Grown to man's estate, the youth wins fame as a warrior, but, in a spirit of filial affection and loyalty not accounted for, he restlessly seeks Rustum, whom he knows to be his father. The two finally meet in mortal combat, neither combatant aware that it is a duel between father and son. The son falls by the hand of his father. That, in short, is the story of "Sohrab and Rustum."

Not a very promising theme for a narrative in verse. Yet conditions might have existed which would have made it not wholly ineligible. If the two warriors had been noble men, enlisted generously on opposite sides in a noble cause, there would have been in the story the elements of possible pathos and power, mounting even to the height of overcoming tragedy—tragedy made tender and beautiful by the presence in it of heroism, of magnanimity, of self-sacrifice, of filial devotion, of paternal affection. But neither combatant seems to have been a soldier for a noble cause; they were both of them apparently mere soldiers of fortune, fighting for nothing better than fame. Rustum at least was an impure man, faithless alike to his wife, if he had one, and to the unwedded mother of his son. If he had traits of virtue, besides courage, to redeem his character to gentle judgment, not to say to admiration, these do not appear, either in the legend about him, which Arnold gives in quoted words as note to his poem, or in the poet's treatment of his subject. There is nothing whatever in Rustum's words or in his deeds, as shown in the poem, to excite the reader's admiration or sympathy for him. He appears unrelievedly brutal throughout. His selfish sorrow at the end is hardly an exception, and the same may be said of the passing touch of pseudo-sympathetic, egoistic sentiment for Sohrab exhibited by him just before the beginning of the combat.

Sohrab, if not a very attractive character, is at least not repulsive like his father. That he should cherish such a filial feeling as he does for a father never personally known by him, but known by him to be so unworthy, is a trait which, besides

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

being extremely improbable, psychologically almost impossible indeed, denotes a sentimental weakness in him of no very high moral tone. He ought to have sought his father, if at all, in order to upbraid him for his unfaithfulness both to his mother and to himself, this far rather than in order to fling his heart down in fondling affection at his father's feet.

The conditions, then, that might have made the "fable" of "Sohrab and Rustum" suitable for a fine poem did not exist, and Arnold must be pronounced unfortunate in his choice of theme. "Unfortunate," I say, but in critical strictness I ought to say, unwise, ill-judging; wrong choice of subject is part of the demerit of a poet considered as artist.

But now let us suppose that the Amphictyonic Council required Arnold to write a poem on this ineligible subject, and let us proceed to consider how he performed his compulsory task. Did he manage his subject well or ill? I am compelled to say that, in my opinion, he managed it ill—in some important respects surprisingly ill.

The chief demerit of "Sohrab and Rustum" lies in its lack of that which would necessarily have been its chief merit had it been present, namely, true imaginative quality. This lack is shown in so many ways that it may justly be said to be pervasive. It appears in the descriptions, in the similes, in the conduct of the narrative, especially the narrative of the combat, and even in the providing of accoutrement for the combatants. Rustum, for instance, is furnished by Arnold with a shield, which, of course, must be carried in such a manner as to make one of his two arms unavailable for any other purpose, except that possibly the hand on that side of the body might grasp the spear, which also is supplied to the warrior; a sword is not omitted from the equipment; but, most noteworthy perhaps of all, Rustum is armed with an enormous club, such in size and weight that no one but Rustum could wield it. Not even Rustum himself, it would seem, could wield it properly; for, at his first and only attempt with it, it plays him false, flies out of his hand, and actually brings its wielder down on all-fours into the sand. If, in addition to mail covering his whole body, even to his hands, Rustum must needs have with him such an amount of encumbering weaponry (together with helmet and shield), Arnold might at least have provided him with an armor-bearer. Instead of this, a horse, a

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

very remarkable horse, accompanies him to the battle, much after the manner of a dog, taking no part whatever in the action, but only, at a certain crisis of it, uttering a most lamentable boding cry, which had the singular effect of making the two watching hostile armies "quake for fear," while, far stranger, the River "Oxus *curdled* as it crossed his stream."

It deserves to be noted that, whereas Arnold gives Rustum a mighty Homeric breakfast the morning of the struggle, he sends Sohrab to his fate breakfastless, and weakened by a night of restless tossing without sleep. This unfairness on the poet's part seems to have been a pure inadvertence, for he makes nothing of the inequality under which the two combatants thus engage; but it is a curious inadvertence, and it has a certain tell-tale bearing. It incidentally shows with how little true imaginative sympathy Arnold, brooding on his theme, entered into the necessary concomitant conditions of the case.

Now as to the incidents of the fight. The two combatants begin by having a parley. Rustum was then first to act. He "hurled his spear"—presumably at Sohrab, though this is not stated; for all that appears at this point in the narrative, it may have been flung wild as a preliminary flourish of demonstration. But its course was peculiar. It was more like that of a battle-axe swung than that of a spear hurled. The language used describes a blow, rather than the flight of a spear. "Down from the shoulder, down it came," the poet says. The downward direction is thus given so emphatically that one is at once prompted to think of the action as taking place at close quarters, and not at such a distance as, on the contrary, *hurling* implies. But the downward direction is further insisted upon, and now with a simile, a singular simile:

> "As on some partridge in the corn, a hawk,
> That long has towered in the airy clouds,
> Drops like a plummet."

The simile, it will be observed, is itself affected with a simile. "Like a plummet," Arnold says. This, considered simply as descriptive of the hawk's descent, is striking, strikingly good. The line, "That long has towered in the airy clouds," introduces a circumstance which seems apt enough as long as one thinks only of the hawk and of the hawk's descent; but the moment one

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

comes to consider the relation of it to the proper object of the poet in his narrative, it is as unapt as it well could be. The flying spear could not have hovered "long" in the air before it "dropped like a plummet." In fact, it is impossible to conceive of a hurled spear's behaving as Rustum's spear did. "Sohrab saw it come and sprang aside quick as a flash." It came "down," the poet says. Did Sohrab see it *coming* down? Then the descent must have occupied an appreciable portion of time. But, since the coming down was only "from the shoulder," how could this be? After Sohrab's agile avoidance of the spear, it is noted by the poet that the spear "hissed." Read a little attentively, and it will almost look to you as if the spear did not "hiss" until it saw that it was going to miss its mark! Whether, indeed, a spear, coming down from the shoulder, could *hiss* on its way, simply as the effect of friction with the air, my own experience with spears, or knowledge of them gained through reading, does not enable me to say; but, as a matter of mere speculation, it seems to me extremely improbable. I prefer to suppose that the spear in the case was conceived by the poet as hissing from vexation at missing its aim.

"Then Sohrab threw, in turn," the poet proceeds to say. *What* Sohrab threw, as well as *at* what, it is left to the reader's mental activity and judgment to decide — until, later, he learns that Sohrab "full struck Rustum's shield," when the second of the two doubts, at what, is resolved. Again the effect produced is described with the emphasis of repetition—"Sharp rang, the iron plates rang sharp," it is said, with "forcible feeble" effort of expression; "but turned the spear" is added, and now we know that it was his spear that Sohrab "threw." As Rustum's shield was "full struck," the statement that the spear was turned cannot mean that the spear was simply deflected and caused to glance aside; the meaning must be that the spear-*point*, and not the spear, was "turned."

Now follows a pass from Rustum very carefully described by Arnold, and well worthy of careful attention from the reader. "And Rustum seized his club," it is said. Where was his club? How had Rustum carried it? What did he do with it when he hurled his spear? We are left to conjecture. Let us suppose that he simply laid it on the ground beside him. Now, at any rate, he "seized" it. It was a portentous club. Arnold describes it

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

elaborately. As has already been said, nobody could wield it but Rustum. It was "an unlopped trunk." Just what an "unlopped trunk" could be it is not easy to imagine. No tree is spoken of, but trunk, used absolutely here, must mean trunk of a tree. Since the object in question was a club, it was not, of course, the trunk of a standing tree. But "lop" means "cut off." "Unlopped" should therefore mean "not cut off." How could a tree-trunk not cut off constitute a club? But perhaps the sense is that the tree-trunk was "unlopped" (not cut off) as to its branches. The branches, then, were still on the trunk. What sort of club would a tree-trunk with branches make? "An unlopped trunk it was, and huge, still rough," the poet says. The adverb, "still," suggests that the roughness was in process of being worn away, but that the wearing-away process was not yet finished. "Rough" may throw a light backward on "unlopped." Does the poet mean that the "trunk," though said to be "unlopped," was indeed lopped, but not closely, that spurs or stubs of the cut-off branches remained on it? Then "unlopped" must be pronounced not a well-chosen adjective.

The poet adds a comparison to assist the reader in appreciating the character of this club. He says the "trunk was

> like those which men in treeless plains
> To build them boats fish from the flooded rivers,
> Hyphasis or Hydaspes, when, high up
> By their dark springs, the wind in winter-time
> Hath made in Himalayan forests wrack,
> And strewn the channels with torn boughs."

("Hyphasis or Hydaspes" savors of Milton.) The comparison is really little help to the reader. It simply says, at some length, that this trunk was "like" any trunk. Curiously enough, however, it hardly succeeds in saying even that; for we have only "boughs," "torn boughs," to furnish the required term of comparison, no "trunks" at all. How large the "torn boughs" supposed may be we are not told. They may be of any size whatever. But the poet, as if now the reader should have no trouble in getting the right conception of the magnitude of that club, says, with evident sense of satisfaction over something difficult happily achieved, "So huge the club which Rustum lifted now."

"And struck one stroke," the poet next says. This seems to

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

be said very pregnantly, somewhat after the manner of Milton's, "No second stroke intend," or of Tennyson's, "Would strike, and firmly, and one stroke"; but the result is so null, so ridiculous, that the phrase itself becomes the reverse of impressive. Good reason, as the sequel shows, why the stroke should be "one" and no more. For Sohrab, as Rustum might have anticipated, especially after the experience immediately preceding, "sprang aside" again; and then happened—several things very surprising. That redoubtable club came "thundering to earth." This is surprising, since the "earth" that it came to was "sand"—as such constantly described by the poet—and how should the club have "thundered" falling into the sand? Next, the club "leaped from Rustum's hand." This, too, is surprising, since Rustum was a warrior of such doughty character, such mighty strength, and withal of such long seasoning experience, that he ought to have been prepared to hold his club, though his club should miss its aim. One might, indeed, suppose that, with presence of mind, Rustum let go his club (for this time proved useless) on purpose, as his best way of ridding himself of it. But no; it was an accident that the club left his hand; and no wonder that it did, since his hand was mailed, and it was only with one hand, of course the right hand, that he attempted to wield it. And now, stranger still than the strange things already mentioned, that experienced warrior lost his balance and came down on all-fours "following his own blow." "On all-fours," for he "fell to his knees," and, besides that, "with his fingers [his mailed fingers] clutched the sand." Rustum must have quite lost his head. Why should he "clutch the sand"? To spread out his hands palm downward would have saved him far better. A vulgar evil genius at my elbow suggests that Rustum felt his own personal "sand" failing him, and instinctively sought to replenish his supply. In vain I remonstrate, "Vex not thou the poet's mind with thy shallow wit, Vex not thou the poet's mind, For thou canst not fathom it." He presses his unworthy suggestion by pointing out that Rustum became "choked with sand." And true enough, it appears that, in Arnold's words, he "lay dizzy, and on his knees, and choked with sand." The whole passage reads:

> "And now might Sohrab have unsheathed his sword
> And pierced the mighty Rustum while he lay
> Dizzy, and on his knees, and choked with sand."

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

(It is curious what pains Arnold takes to tell us that Rustum "*lay,*" but did so "*on his knees*"!) That insufferable evil genius, impudently insisting on his point, says his theory is that Rustum, clutching the sand, with the purpose aforesaid, was confused through his dizziness, and so overcharged his mouth with it—whence the choking. But, of course, the true theory is that Rustum pitched forward with such momentum that his face ducked into the sand, and his mouth, unfortunately being open at the moment, filled itself involuntarily. Altogether, it was a complicated catastrophe, and, under all the conditions existing in the case, very surprising indeed.

Yes, as the poet says, Sohrab obviously could now have despatched his antagonist, or have made him accept life at his magnanimous enemy's hands;

> "But he looked on and smiled, nor bared his sword,
> But courteously drew back and spoke."

A Quixotic knight this young man was! He "drew back," and did so "courteously," and yet—he "smiled." Did he smile "courteously"? It would have been more courteous to refrain from smiling. Did Sohrab lose his gentlemanlike self-command, was he overcome with uncontrollable merriment, to see his friend the enemy's mishap? This unhappy lapse of his in high manners, he might have covered by advancing, instead of drawing back, advancing to the assistance of Rustum in regaining his feet! But perhaps it was a truer delicacy on his part to let Rustum show that he could get up without help!

By the way, this drawing back of Sohrab is the first change of position noted on the part of either combatant; or at least Rustum "hurled his spear," Sohrab "threw," Rustum "seized his club" and struck his "one stroke," all, so far as appears from the poem, without either one's moving either backward or forward, though Sohrab did twice spring "aside." Arnold's imagination was strangely unconcerned and inactive about all such details.

But Sohrab's smile was not a smile of amusement, as certainly it was not a smile of complaisance. It must have been a derisive smile. This is made clear by Sohrab's first words; they were taunting words, uttered when he "spoke and said":

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

"Thou strik'st too hard! That club of thine will float
Upon the summer floods and not my bones."

How derision, expressed whether in smile or in words, could be made to comport with courtesy, it would require Arnold himself to explain.

Enough now of this. "Too much, too much already, far too much," I hear some reader exclaim, who, admiring Arnold and perhaps loving him, has nevertheless, however impatiently, followed me thus far. "What good is to be looked for from such minute, microscopic, teasing, carping criticism? How much more satisfactory, how much more truly illuminating, would be a criticism that rises to a higher point of view, that takes a free, a large, a liberal range, interprets sympathetically, inspires to generous admiration! What poetry is there that could stand question on such a rack as that of this critic?" To which I reply: Any good poetry, any true poetry, could not only stand it, but come out proved all the better for the trial. Of course there is very little, if any, *perfect* poetry in the world, and, therefore, in the very best that we have some flaws could no doubt be found, should one search for them with adequately discerning eyes. But in all true poetry, the good would outweigh the bad, and, in the truest, the good would make the bad count for little, or even for almost nothing at all. No good poem could possibly yield to the most searching assay such a result as is left in our hands after a fair examination of "Sohrab and Rustum."

"But have you not picked out the most vulnerable part of the poem for the present examination?" My answer is, I do not think so; I certainly have not meant to; the whole poem is, I believe, fairly represented by the passage that we have examined. There is indeed one place of the narrative, and that the crisis of it, the hinge on which it turns, that is even more open to fair ridicule than is the place with which we have been engaged. If the levity, or, as Arnold would say in a case concerning himself, the "vivacity," to which I was overcomingly tempted in treating that place, exposes me to just rebuke, I may at least, in mitigation of blame, plead the example of Arnold himself dealing critically with authors whom he disapproved. A serious problem for the poet to solve in the execution of his task was how to bring about at length that mutual recognition between the two combatants which was necessary to the final tragic and pathetic effect aimed

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

at in the poem. It cannot be denied that this was a delicate and difficult thing to manage, but a more unhappy way of managing it than that hit upon by Arnold it would be hard to imagine. Rustum had made a great point of not being identified, or identifiable, as Rustum. He went to the combat with undistinguished armor, and he parried every attempt from Sohrab to make him acknowledge that he was indeed that redoubtable warrior. He would conquer by prowess and not by fame. But when Sohrab, after delivering two effective passes with his sword, at length stood suddenly helpless and weaponless, only the hilt of a blade that had been shattered with his last blow, remaining in his hand, then Rustum, with a fine chance offered him to be as magnanimous toward his antagonist as his antagonist had been toward him, so far from availing himself of that chance—well, what can it be supposed that Rustum would do? Let the poet tell:

> "Then Rustum raised his head; his dreadful eyes
> Glared, and he shook on high his menacing spear
> And [can it be believed?] shouted, 'Rustum!'"

Why he shouted "Rustum!" does not appear. It could hardly have been to reveal himself in his true identity, for to be unknown was a condition upon which he had insisted throughout—at least until now, and now there was less reason than before for making himself known; he had his antagonist helpless at his mercy. Was "Rustum!" his usual battle-cry? Then why had he not used it before, or, rather, since he had not used it before, why should he use it now? It seems idle to conjecture. It could not have been to strike terror to Sohrab's heart, and so render him an easier prey to his spear. He was prey easy enough already. It seems like a pure freak of pure savagery—that shout, "Rustum!" To the wisely thoughtful reader it has the effect of bathos as absolute as possible. To Sohrab it had a very different effect. It unnerved him, not with panic fear; not with a sudden conviction of the shout's meaning that this was Rustum, his father. No, for just after, with Rustum's spear deep in his side, Sohrab exclaims, "Unknown thou art." The young warrior was unnerved, he says, simply by the sound of the name, "Rustum," issuing from his antagonist's throat! This is the way in which he says it:

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

"Thou dost not slay me, proud and boastful man!
No, Rustum slays me and this filial heart."

Then the fatally wounded man becomes himself "boastful" and says:

"For, were I matched with ten such men as thee [thou]
And I were that which till to-day I was,
They should be lying here, I standing there,
But that beloved name unnerved my arm"—

The climax of Arnold's narrative is the climax of his mismanagement. But it is unnecessary to pursue farther the critical analysis of it.

It may be asked now: Granted that plot and narrative were out of Arnold's true line, yet is there not true poetry in the descriptions, and in the various similes interspersed through the text? A fair question; let us answer it fairly.

As an example of the similes that the poem contains, I quote:

"As when some hunter in the spring hath found
A breeding eagle sitting on her nest,
Upon the craggy isle of a hill-lake,
And pierced her with an arrow as she rose,
And followed her to find her where she fell
Far off; anon her mate comes winging back
From hunting, and a great way off descries
His huddling young left sole; at that, he checks
His pinion, and with short uneasy sweeps
Circles above his eyry, with loud screams
Chiding his mate back to her nest; but she
Lies dying, with the arrow in her side,
In some far stony gorge out of his ken,
A heap of fluttering feathers,—never more
Shall the lake glass her, flying over it;
Never the black and dripping precipices
Echo her stormy scream as she sails by,—
As that poor bird flies home, nor knows his loss,
So Rustum knew not his own loss, but stood
Over his dying son and knew him not."

"Is not that fine?" I am asked. There are fine things in it, I reply, but considered as a whole it is not fine; it is indeed far from fine; it is even sharply the very reverse of fine. "The black and dripping precipices," "her stormy scream," are fine descrip-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

tive phrases; "a heap of fluttering feathers" is a phrase fine in a modified sense simply because it is effective. But now consider the passage as a whole. Its ostensible reason of existing in its place is to illustrate a situation in the narrative. Does it happily serve this illustrative purpose? Look attentively through the passage, and what points of resemblance do you discover between the circumstances of the one case and the circumstances of the other? Are there *any* points of resemblance, except that in each case there is a victim dying with a missile weapon infixed in the side? And yet this sole point of resemblance is neglected by the poet, when he comes to the turn of his simile, and the whole complex mechanism that he has constructed is employed to tell us that, as the male eagle does not know his mate is dying in a distant glen, so Rustum does not know that it is his son dying at his feet! Was there ever anything in poetry at once more ambitious and more nugatory?

I make no account of the broken syntax in this long sentence of Arnold's,—which those who will may regard as "noble negligence,"—but I feel that I must point out the extremely inartistic manner in which the poet contrives to divide and distract both the attention and the sympathy of the reader, and this, through the introduction of matters not at all pertinent to his own true purpose. First, there is a hunter introduced, who "hath found" a mother eagle "sitting on her nest" "and [hath] pierced her with an arrow as she rose [note the awkward sequence of the tense in "rose"] and [hath] followed her to find her where she fell far off"—which is the last of the "hunter." Next, the mother eagle's mate comes in for a share of the reader's attention. This mate "wings" back, and "a great way off" descries what again divides the reader's attention—namely, "his huddling young left sole." "His huddling young" seems to be a plural expression; could several eaglets huddling together be properly described as "sole"? But perhaps the poet's nice taste forbade him the alliteration of "left lone" or "left lorn." The male eagle is "a great way off" when he gets this view. What does he accordingly do? Why, "at that he checks his pinion"—was he flying with one pinion?—and by simply "*checking*" his pinion he, singularly enough, traverses the long intervening distance and arrives immediately at a point directly above the nest, and there "circles" about it, "with loud screams chiding his mate back to her nest"

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

—which is the last of him until, six lines later, he is for a moment returned to. Meantime, the reader is invited by the poet to consider the sad fate of the mother bird, pathetically presented through those six intervening lines. Finally, it comes out that, as the dying mother eagle's mate does not know that she is dying, so Rustum does not know who it is that is dying at his feet!

I have just now looked afresh through the poem, from beginning to end, with a view to considering carefully whether there were any good similes in it. I found a noticeably large number of similes, but among them all only one that strikes me as good, and that one is not, to my mind, more than passably good. Almost all of them are forced and unapt—some of them are remarkably so. Take this, for example; the poet is setting forth how glad the Persians were to see Rustum appear as their champion against Sohrab:

> "And dear as the wet diver to the eyes
> Of his pale wife who waits and weeps on shore,
> By sandy Bahrein, in the Persian Gulf,
> Plunging all day in the blue waves, at night,
> Having made up his tale of precious pearls,
> Rejoins her in their hut upon the sands,—
> So dear to the pale Persians Rustum came."

It is really extraordinary to see Arnold go so far and fetch so little. Probably he was so well pleased at having hit upon something that would seem to fit as happily harmonious in point of local color, that he neglected to see how what he had hit upon was recommended by nothing else than simply that. The professional diver's wife would not stay "pale," would not "wait and weep on shore," *habitually,* as it is implied that she would, while her husband was plying his vocation, "plunging all day in the blue waves." Curiously enough, according to the syntax of the passage, it is the "pale wife" that does the "plunging," as it is also the "pale wife" that "rejoins her"—"rejoins" having no other grammatical subject than "who" preceding, and that "who" meaning the wife. But, of course, we know what the poet means, although at the same time we know he does not say what he means.

Now, no longer delayed by faults of form, let us consider the substance of the simile. What are the resemblances that make it fit and felicitous? The wife is "pale," though we do not see

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

why she should be, and the Persians are "pale," though we do not see why they should be; indeed, the paleness of the Persians is even more an improbability than is the paleness of the woman. However, the two parties are somehow "pale," and that constitutes one resemblance; in the end, both parties are pleased, and that constitutes another resemblance. This latter resemblance is the only one made use of by the poet; the simile accordingly reduces itself to this: As one party is pleased, so is the other. The differences between the two, making the simile unfit, are very wide. In the first case, the party is one, and a woman; in the second case, the party is a numerous host, composed exclusively of men. In the first case, the relief experienced is relief from anxiety on behalf of another; in the second case, the relief experienced is relief from anxiety on the party's own behalf. In the first case, the element of personal affection plays an important part; in the second case, the element of personal affection cannot be supposed to enter at all.

Considering the other characters involved, we note that, in the first case, the party is a diver, who has been endangered, and who escapes "wet"; in the second case, the party is a warrior who has as yet certainly incurred no danger, and who comes forth supposably quite dry! It may, I think, justly be said that any example whatever of relief from anxiety, afforded by the opportune appearing of some one, would form as good a basis for a simile, appropriate to the occasion created here by the poem, as is the example invented by Arnold. In short, simile-making, the divining of similitudes, is decidedly not Arnold's strong point.

"At any rate," it may be said, "there is the famous concluding passage of the poem—you will concede that that is fine, will you not, more than fine, truly magnificent?" Alas, and alas, why should I, with question upon question such, be teased and tempted into exhibiting myself quite without critical mercy? Since challenged so, I must, I suppose, continue to be frank. Briefly and abruptly, then, to say the worst at once and have it over, I cannot admit this famous passage to be worthy of its fame. It has merit, but its merit is not that of high poetry, nor even of good literary art. What it essentially is must be set down as nothing better than a bit of fluvial geography couched in musical, and sometimes poetical, blank verse. I assume that the geography is accurate; I have not made an independent study of it, but ap-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

parently the poet did this, and I shall not raise any question as to the trustworthiness of his result.

> "But the majestic river floated on,
> Out of the mist and hum of that low land"—

so Arnold starts his concluding strain, with evident purpose to have a pensively soothing contrast to the bloody scene that has just been enacted on the Oxus shore—by presenting to us the impassive river pursuing its course unmindful of the human tragedy it has witnessed. (I ought to explain that the "hum" in the case was "as of a great assembly loosed" [*sic*]—"for now both armies moved to camp and took their meal." A casual and temporary "hum" therefore it was, though Arnold mentions it here as if it affected the landscape like the "mist" by the operation of natural causes.) Simply exclaiming, "mist and *hum!*" —the combination!—"hum!"—and then remarking, as I pass, that rivers in general do not "float," and that doubtless the "majestic" Oxus was no exception to the rule, I point out that there were two different ways open to the choice of the poet in which to conceive and represent the flowing of the river in connection with his now concluded narrative. One way was, to conceive and represent it as it would appear observed by a person on the bank, say, a sympathetic bystander near the prostrate forms of the dead son and the mourning father. The other way was, to conceive and represent it as it would appear observed by a person floating down-stream on the bosom of the river to its mouth. The poet mistakenly chose the latter of these two ways. The effect is to detach the river at once from all relation to the narrative of the poem, and to engage the reader in a series of observations on the various fortunes that befall the stream on its way to the sea. In other words, that which alone could justify any such attention from the poet as he here bestows on the river—namely, its relation to his narrative, is quite forgotten by him, and the famous conclusion of "Sohrab and Rustum" becomes an unrelated mere geographical description, with no artistic right to its place where it stands—ostensibly *in* the poem, but really outside it, being not at all *of* it.

If, on the other hand, Arnold had chosen the way that he did not choose, of conceiving and representing the flowing of the river, one can easily imagine a perfectly legitimate, gently pathetic

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

effect produced by a meditative strain dwelling on the everlasting æonian lapse of the waters, forever and forever the same, unaffected by what might befall, whether of good or of ill, to humankind on the sandy shore which, with full current or slack, from season to season, they ceaselessly and impassively wash. But instead of being thus set to musing on eternity symbolized in the monotonous, unending, solemn flow of the great river and contrasted with the fragility and evanescence of human life and its subjection to all vicissitudes of chance and change, the reader is started off on a voyage down the length of the stream, with a personal conductor at his side poetically pointing out the features of the various channels into which the current divides itself and the aspects of the landscape through which it passes on its "foiled circuitous" wandering to the sea.

It is fair to note that in this passage, as it stands, there are fine touches, touches of a true poetic quality. "Under the solitary moon" is such a touch. So is "the hushed Chorasmian waste." "Bright speed" would be, but that it is hindered by the inharmonious context, "the bright speed he had in his high mountain cradle." "Speed" in a "cradle" seems not happy. That the adjective "bright" should occur three times in the passage may be set down to the acount of an Homeric carelessness about such repetitions; but the passage as a whole is very un-Homeric. Apropos of the adjective just named, I cannot refrain from admiring exceedingly a phrase that comes earlier in the poem, and has in it subtly something of both the brilliance attributed to the sea and the oscillating motion described;

> "As the vast tide
> Of the *bright rocking ocean* sets to shore
> At the full moon."

If the present paper were a review of Arnold's poetry, the examination that has here been made of his "Sohrab and Rustum" would, though far from complete, be disproportionately long. But the present paper is not such a review. It is simply a series of assays of the "Sohrab and Rustum" undertaken with a view to determining, so far as that single work might enable us to determine, the true merit and value of Arnold's poetic production as a whole. The promise of the title has accordingly been fulfilled.

W. C. WILKINSON.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

FRANCE AND HER VANISHING POPULATION.

BY FREDERIC COURTLAND PENFIELD.

PRESENT-DAY France is confronted by many political and administrative problems; but the problem overshadowing all these is that of her gradually diminishing birth-rate, for never in modern times have vital statistics conveyed a fact that should be more disquieting than the records of the last decade that prove indisputably this waning of population in a grand country.

And in ironical contrast does the science of statistics show that the nation which was once the foe, and is destined ever to be the rival, of France is increasing so positively in numbers that there may soon be two Germans to every Frenchman. To have the fact of racial decay published to the world must be a hundredfold more galling than loss of territory through even inglorious warfare, and the true significance of this monstrous curbing of nature's law is that the cruelest enemies of glorious France are to-day, as they have always been, her own sons and daughters.

Alas, proud France! She who has blazoned history with envied achievements in civilization and culture, and signal triumphs in science and art, is now the first in the family of nations to show a death-rate in excess of the number of births. Twenty years ago the average number of births per marriage was three; it is now scarcely two. And while the vigorous Teutonic blood has increased the German race until the Fatherland averages 256 souls to the square mile, the average for France is but 188.

Winging time has exploded no theory having better semblance of concrete law than that of Thomas Robert Malthus, whose essay a hundred years ago on the "Principles of Population" attracted the widest possible attention. This divine's insistence that the tendency of population to increase in a higher ratio than the means of subsistence—this is the Malthusian doctrine—meant the

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

general pauperism of the British Isles, if not the starvation of their people; but Malthus made the fatal blunder of not taking into consideration the ability of the British to levy upon the food-supply of the outside world in exchange for the products of their workshops and mines, which policy, when adopted, made the nation rich and powerful. What remained of the scholarly Englishman's theory is now hopelessly destroyed by the lessening birth-rate of France coincidently with the augmentation of the soil's productivity through scientific tillage and the employment of machinery.

Unpopular as it is for a Frenchman to herald national calamity, M. de Foville, President of the Académie des Sciences Morales et Politiques, has recently accentuated the gravity of his country's position in a style so plain that the Latin countries are discussing what students of international affairs have long known—that the French race is slowly but surely dying. For twenty years the birth-rate has been waning; two years ago it was on a parity with the death-rate, and last year it fell 20,000 behind. In a hundred years it has decreased from 32 per thousand to 19.7; and in the twentieth century the decline has followed this alarming pace: excess of births over deaths, 1902, 84,000; 1903, 73,000; 1904, 57,000; 1905, 37,000; 1906, 27,000. In 1907 zero was reached and passed, for there were 20,000 more deaths than births, as has been stated. The official returns are 794,000 and 774,000 under these respective heads. The word "depopulation," M. de Foville points out, is, therefore, no exaggeration. "Is it," he asks, with pardonable apprehension, "the beginning of the end?"

At this rate, the Gallic republic may soon be ripe for invasion, for this will be a danger frankly menacing a country which is capable of supporting 80,000,000 inhabitants, but which is content with less than half that number. In 1875, the population of Germany surpassed that of France by only 6,000,000; it now exceeds it by over 20,000,000. In another twenty years there may be two Germans for every Frenchman, without counting the subjects of the Kaiser swarming in Brazil, Argentina and the United States. M. de Foville has thus had the courage to tell his fellow countrymen that their nation is "marching with quickened step to its doom."

If there was no French immigration there would be a more decided census recession, but the Germans, Swiss, Italians and

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Belgians, who for years have been flocking into France, rescue the totals from a more disquieting significance than they now have. Another generation of man-power in Germany, it can be plainly estimated, will have prodigious force, not alone giving her double the number of conscripts available to France, but a material force in commerce with which France cannot readily cope. "Then she will devour us," say French alarmists.

As almost any topic can be argued from varying standpoints, a few English economists pretend to doubt the general pessimism of those writing on the diminution of the French people, and are asking, "Is the example which France presents to be looked upon as a reach forward to a better dispensation, or as a sign of yielding in the fight for existence?" All countries, more or less, are discussing some aspect or other of the population question, as ancient a problem as mankind itself. But, while most people can regard the falling birth-rate of France only as a token of decay, it is curious to learn that some of the best philosophical thought of the day sees for the Frenchman of the future a person of better understanding, better fibre, better culture and better endowment in material things. And some of these economists are arguing that race suicide, in the sense of a deliberate limitation of population to the means of subsistence and to a definite standard of living, is not, when practised by a people instead of by a small and well-to-do class, to be construed as necessarily a sign of degeneration, but rather as the starting-point of a higher civilization.

But while academicians may upon these lines make out a very good case, France herself should be more disturbed than exalted by the success of her experiment. "More deliberately and completely than any other country she cuts her garment according to her cloth, she regulates her population by her resources and her well-worn social arrangements," is the comment of a foreign writer who seems to approve the French population policy.

Of all European nations she is perhaps the most placid, prosperous and provident, has been the most deeply civilized; and she is still all this, in her judgment, because the most strictly limited. No American and but few persons of Anglo-Saxon blood can probably be found who would endorse the principle of birth control, or who would, for reasons of property division, go to the inhuman length of approving of small families. The idea, happily, is wholly French.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Thrift, the essence and foundation of the current French character, is responsible for the controlled birth-rate. This is the only opinion that can be arrived at by the fair-minded investigator when he finds incorporated in the country's legal code the provision of forced equal testamentary division of property which is responsible for the contracting France. And this is but a roundabout way of saying "greed," and the greed that can only be spelled with a large G.

Moralists allege other reasons—laxity of the laws that control those following the vocation of *sage-femme,* whose advertisements fearlessly hint at criminal practices; and the ridiculous ease with which divorce is obtainable—it is a fact that there is a decided increase in the severance of matrimonial ties as the birth-rate decreases. Last year the courts of France granted nearly eleven thousand divorces, the highest number ever recorded.

Other apologists claim that the development of France as a manufacturing country draws the young of both sexes from agricultural districts to the cities and towns, where familiar intercourse and pernicious teachings, assisted by a base class of publications, corrupt thousands and divert them from marriage. The growing burden of taxation is only one of many other explanations, and in this connection it is pointed out that recent legislation has imposed increasingly harder conditions on the bread-winner with a family to support. The new income tax, for instance, makes no distinction between the bachelor and the married man with a numerous progeny.

Devout Catholics insist that the breach between Government and Church has been the controlling influence in lowering the birth-rate, for it used to be the teaching of pastor and curate that it was the sacred duty of every God-fearing husband and wife to bring into existence a family of goodly number. Others argue with equal effect that the love of luxury that has sprung up in recent years is making the men and women of France selfish to an inordinate degree, too selfish to share their time and substance with children.

All these explanations are trivial and secondary, for the actual reason is the racial thrift of the people—the same thrift which enabled the French to easily satisfy the German war indemnity which to other countries would have been of paralyzing weight, which makes their hoarded savings a fiscal fact having no national

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

counterpart, and which makes France the banker of Europe. And thrift of a certain kind is nothing but greed, surely.

Defenders of current French conditions insist that it is only natural that a prudent parent, whose competence has resulted from a long practice of economy, should prefer to leave one or two children comparatively well off rather than to have the family nest-egg apportioned among six or eight. The law preventing anything but a *pro rata* division, there can be no special provision for an elder son or an invalid, no material acknowledgment of primogeniture, or for a son or daughter of exceptional promise or sentimental attachment, it will be seen. And further, these oracles say that French law is but the concrete form of popular will, thereby giving support to the contention that the people want it as it now is. Anybody having intimate acquaintance with France well knows that it is as natural for Jacques and Marie to economize as to breathe, and that the controlling article of faith of the *bourgeois* class prescribes thrift, constantly and in every form. Thus, the American may readily perceive, the French law of bequest is a check as effective upon the birth-rate as the invention of Westinghouse is a check upon the speed of the railway train.

When obliged to divide his property equally among his children, and when he knows that the same restriction will be applied to their children when their turn comes, the citizen of France usually elects to have a limited family. The dowry system, again, operates in the same direction. Everywhere an additional child means additional expense; in France it means an extra dowry as well, and that is an added reason why the French have few children. So long as the present property law exists, and the dowry custom obtains, there can be no "solution" of French depopulation. France is manifestly deriving from her inheritance policy an immense diffusion of prosperity, and certain publicists are applauding the national policy, and boldly asserting that it is more than wise to promote greater equality in the distribution of wealth.

There is no other country in the world where the soil is so subdivided as it is in France. But it is a sad fact that of late years the rural districts have been deserted for the cities. Thoughtful politicians are now trying to form a plan for getting the population "back to the land." A few months since a measure passed

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

the Chamber giving rural laborers an opportunity to acquire on easy terms a plot of tillable land and a homestead. The plan is just going into operation, and its advocates insist that it will insure better provision for the evening of life than any old-age pension scheme. Any measure which will bring the people into a state of pastoral comfort is bound to help the birth-rate.

No urgent reason exists why the American woman who annually loads up with the wares of the Rue de la Paix should lose her head after reading about race decline in *La Belle France*. The people to whom the world turns for creations in frocks and hats and fluffy things, so irresistible to the fashionable woman with the portly pocketbook, is perennial; and the man too fastidious to wear any but made-to-order Doucet cravats can have his commands filled until the crack of doom, probably. It is safe to believe that there will always be French people to barter their taste and handiwork for the sound American dollar. And France will always be inhabited, surely, even in defiance of the croakings of economists and paraded dry-as-dust figures!

To a Christian people living in a free land, the judgment that French thrift is being carried to the point of inhumanity must surely obtain, and when the current page of French history is read it will be admitted that President Roosevelt's preachment against race suicide was not altogether idle talk.

One may *see* the falling off in the number of French children. For twenty years I have known the country fairly well, and in the past two summers I have traversed six or seven thousand miles of French roads, from frontier to frontier in almost every direction. The foremost observation of the motorist is naturally the peerless thoroughfares, but the secondary observation must be the infrequency with which children are seen on the road or in front of habitations. In provincial France, as in other European countries away from the centres of population, the highway is the natural playground of children of the peasant class. Roads in Italy and Germany bristle with juvenile life; but France is no sooner entered than a tremendous falling off is noticed. The observant traveller by automobile surely comprehends what is meant by the phrase "French depopulation"—he sees it. And in Germany, on the other hand, he must ever have in mind Bismarck's assertion that "she is the best mother who gives the Fatherland the greatest number of children," for he

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

will have constant evidence of the people's endorsement of the Great Chancellor's opinion.

It is the daughters of France who suffer most from a critical study of the nation's plight. The Frenchwoman must not be confounded with the "Parisienne" or with the rarefied types of femininity seen by the tourist in Paris restaurant or park—these exotics are wickedly wasteful. The truly representative and valued Frenchwoman is she of the great middle class, who is conscientious and industrious, neither frivolous nor impure, who dresses with taste upon half what her sisters of other lands spend, and who is her husband's helpmate as few women can be. But she is, in the very nature of things, mercenary and avaricious, and from economical motives has permitted herself to drift into an environment peopled only by the narrow-minded and self-centred. She knows little of the world beyond the limits of her own vision.

Yet this woman is nearly always a good wife, pious and prudent, but her thoughts seldom stray from her savings, and what she means to do for Louis, proposing to leave the Corps d'Afrique because he can never hope to win the cross of the Legion of Honor; or for *petite* Hortense, who, if the *dot* be large enough, may marry a young wine broker down Bordeaux way whose rich father can easily get the red ribbon for him in ten years. *Voilà!*

FREDERIC COURTLAND PENFIELD.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

THE ORGANIZATION OF THE CATHOLIC CHURCH IN THE UNITED STATES.

BY THOMAS F. MEEHAN.

By the terms of the Apostolic Constitution "*Sapienti consilio*" Pius X decreed that, on November 3rd, 1908, the United States should cease to be regarded as a missionary country and on that date should pass from the tutelage of the Sacred Congregation of the Propaganda to his own immediate supervision. The change is most important as affecting not only the membership of the great religious body over which he exercises his jurisdiction, but incidentally the whole community in which it occupies so influential a position. It is the purpose of this article to give a detailed description of the organization of the Catholic Church in the United States.

In these days of social unrest and threatened conflict between labor and capital, reference is often made by political economists to the reliance many place on the Catholic Church as an effective barrier against the menacing forces of anarchy and disorder. Ever a conservative influence on the side of constituted authority, with its wonderful and comprehensive detail, the Church reaches into every hamlet of the land, into every walk of life, warning her millions of adherents that they are bound in conscience to heed the moral law as she interprets it, and conform to the civil law as administered by its justly ordained officials, drawing strictly the line of ownership, and the duties, in their separate spheres, of employer and employee. On the human side, the democracy of the Church appeals forcefully to the American mind. To her priesthood, taken mainly from the ranks of the people, her highest offices are open, personal merit and capacity being the all-potent factors of promotion. The peasant-born Joseph Sarto,

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

placed on the throne of St. Peter by the ballots of his peers, is the latest notable instance of this.

"America has a good right to be called the eldest daughter of the Church; for, although she entered last among the nations, she has given proofs of her loyalty, devotion and tolerance," said Pius X addressing a band of Catholic pilgrims from various parts of the United States to whom he accorded a recent audience.

The statistics of the Catholic Church Officials for 1908 claim that there are now 23,452,426 members of the faith living under the protection of the Stars and Stripes. Of these 13,877,426 are in the United States; 7,058,699 in the Philippines; 1,578,862 in Cuba; 1,000,000 in Porto Rico and 32,000 in the Sandwich Islands. How few know of the workings, the constitution and the management of the vast executive machine by which this great section of the republic is directed in its religious thought and action.

In the United States, the Catholic community is now divided into fourteen provinces or archdioceses, with 78 suffragan sees or dioceses. In these there are a Cardinal, 15 Archbishops, 91 Bishops, 15,655 priests, 12,513 churches, 4,443 schools with 1,136,906 pupils; 268 colleges and 997 institutions sheltering 1,310,300 children. Each diocese is independent in itself, like the States of our Union. Each Bishop is as supreme in his own diocese as is the Governor of a State. The priests are of two kinds—8,408 diocesan or secular clerics and 4,105 members of the regular Orders. The diocesan priests, ordained as subjects of the several dioceses, are bound in obedience to the Bishop of that diocese and cannot leave it without his permission, nor would they be received elsewhere without an "*exeat*," the formal document which states that they are in good standing and had received the Bishop's sanction for withdrawal. These priests take the vows of obedience and celibacy only. The "regular" priests, or those belonging to the Orders, such as the Jesuits, Franciscans, Dominicans, Redemptorists, Benedictines and the like, and living in community, take an additional vow of poverty. Individually, the latter do not own anything and are immediately subject to their superiors and not to the Bishop. They cannot locate in a diocese without the Bishop's permission; but once they are admitted he has no control over them individually or over their property. Of course, they must comply with the ordinary can-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

onical regulations, but otherwise they are individually outside his jurisdiction.

The diocesan priests are subject to the Bishop's will and can be moved about as he sees fit. The only exceptions to this are the rectors of a certain number of parishes incumbency of which brings permanency of tenure. Removal from them can only be effected for grave offences and after due trial. These permanent or "irremovable" rectorships number about ten per cent. of the parishes in the diocese, and appointment to them is won in a competitive examination limited to those who have been ordained priests fifteen years, who have served five years as pastors, and who have shown special ability as executives, besides moral and sacerdotal zeal and worth. These permanent rectors have the right when the Bishop dies to vote for the three names that are sent to Rome as those of the candidates worthy to succeed to the office. The Bishops of the province also send a similar list of three names, which may be the same as, or different from, those decided on by the priests as they deem best. For the nomination of Bishops, the Pope is supreme and free in his choice. He may, if he considers it best, discard both the lists submitted by the priests and the Bishops and name an outside candidate of his own selection. This is done when local differences among the electors or general conditions indicate that the choice of a neutral stranger might be beneficial to the harmony, discipline and progress of the Church in the diocese in question; but due regard is usually paid to the nominations made by the local electors. The Archbishops are usually promoted from some suffragan or other see, and in their selection the Pope generally has the suggestion and counsel of the other members of the hierarchy, but is in no way bound to act on their opinions. He can send a Bishop from a foreign see to take charge if he wishes, as was done, for instance, in the case of Mgr. Persico, at Savannah, in 1870.

The official head of this body is not Cardinal Gibbons, as is commonly supposed. The ranking prelate of the Church in the United States is the Apostolic Delegate, His Excellency the Most Rev. Diomede Falconio, Titular Archbishop of Larissa. As the personal representative of the Pope, he takes precedence at all ecclesiastical functions. Cardinal Gibbons has no jurisdiction outside the limits of the archdiocese of Baltimore, which comprises only the counties of Maryland lying west of the Chesapeake Bay

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

and the District of Columbia, of which he is the Metropolitan. His office of Cardinal gives him no more episcopal authority than is enjoyed by any other member of the hierarchy in the United States, each Bishop being supreme within the limits of his own diocese. Baltimore, however, was the first see created in the United States, so its Archbishop, by request of the other prelates, and with the sanction of a special decree of the Pope, is given the right of presiding over the deliberations of the hierarchy when they are assembled together. Other than this, Cardinal Gibbons has no personal authority over any Catholic or ecclesiastic in the United States outside the limits of the archdiocese of Baltimore. In Rome, he would take his place in the College of Cardinals, which is, as it were, the Senate of the Church.

The autonomy of each diocese, like that of the States of the Union, is strictly defined. The Bishop of each is appointed directly by the Pope, and divides his jurisdiction therein with no one. He is responsible for its proper administration only to Rome. The Archbishops for some time have met in council once a year to discuss matters of Church policy, but their deliberations are advisory only. The Bishops of a province at times meet in a provincial council to legislate on local business. When all the hierarchy of the country assemble together, the assembly is called a Plenary Council, and the decrees thereat enacted, when considered and sanctioned at Rome, are promulgated for the government of the Church throughout the country. There have been three of these Plenary Councils held so far, the first in 1852, the second in 1866 and the third in 1879.

Once a Bishop is appointed to his see, he is ever after during his life a charge on the diocese, unless he voluntarily relinquishes his claims. Owing to the great increase of Catholics in the country, nearly all the Bishops have either coadjutors or auxiliary Bishops. The coadjutors are now appointed with the right of succession; the auxiliaries have not this right. Neither have any jurisdiction in a diocese except what the Bishop in charge may assign them. These assistant prelates take their titles from some of the extinct sees in the Far East. When, a little more than a hundred years ago, the foundation of the first Catholic Cathedral in the United States was laid in Baltimore, there were only one Bishop, 50 priests and about 100,000 Catholics in the whole country.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

In dividing up the country, the Church does not follow the civic or political boundaries, though in creating the fourteen provinces and their 78 suffragan sees some care is taken to try and have them conform, as far as convenient, to the restrictions of State lines. The dioceses are subdivided into deaneries, and these into the separate parishes and missions. The pastors are appointed by the Bishops. The laity have no participation whatever in their selection. The salaries of the priests are paid by each parish. The pastor gets, in New York, $800 a year, with a house and his board. There is no increase in this amount, no matter how long he serves, and it is the same for St. Patrick's great Cathedral and for the humblest country parish. In other dioceses, the salaries range about the same. In some few, the pastors get $1,000 a year, but never any more.

Where the parishes are large the pastor is allowed a number of assistants in accordance with the needs of the people. During the first three years after ordination, these assistants receive a salary of $500 a year, and then $600 with board until they become pastors. The offerings made by the people at baptisms, weddings, etc., go into a common fund used to support the parish rectory and are not the personal perquisites of the officiating clergyman. Each parish is a unit, and the rector of one cannot officiate in another without the permission of the priest in charge. The laity must also attend and support the church of the parish within whose limits they reside if they expect the ministrations of its priests. They cannot go about at will.

The Bishop's salary is paid by what is called "the *Cathedraticum*"—that is, a tax laid on each parish according to its numerical or financial standing. In New York, this ranges from $200 a year, paid by the great city parishes, to a nominal sum from the poorer ones. It might be inferred from this that the income of the prelate of a large see—like New York, for instance—was an imposing sum. What the Archbishop of such a see thus receives is almost immediately paid out again. His household is an expensive item, with a constant succession of distinguished visiting prelates. He must travel much about the diocese, and he is ever the dispenser of help to many poor and needy parishes which look to him for aid. No American prelate would be considered a man of any fortune, and none of them so far has ever left any but a nominal estate.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Cardinal Manning used to say that the true priest dies without money and without debts, and, as a general rule, priests and prelates aim at this standard, although they are not bound by any vow of poverty, except in the case of priests belonging to the regular Orders. When a Bishop is appointed to a see, he makes an official and duplicate will, by the terms of which the property he may die seized of is passed on to two of his associate Bishops in trust for the diocese. Parish property in New York, and generally also elsewhere, is vested in a corporation made up of the Bishop, the Vicar-General, the pastor and two laymen. The pastor, of course, directs the affairs, but he cannot make any large expenditures or engage in any operations of importance without the sanction of the Bishop and the diocesan council. A pastor may be moved about, except in the case of the "missionary" or permanent rectors, at the will of the Bishop. If the pastor, however, feels that an injustice has been done him, he can appeal from the Bishop to the Apostolic Delegate at Washington, and through him to Rome, and the cases are not unknown where the priest has won, though Rome is usually very slow to decide against episcopal authority.

The officials assisting a Bishop in the administration of diocesan affairs are the Vicar-General, who acts for the Bishop in all except the essentially episcopal attributes; the Chancellor, who looks after the records and issues the dispensations; the six Consultors, three of whom are named by the Bishop and three by the priests themselves; the School Board; the Examiners of the Clergy, the Theological Censors, the Diocesan Attorney, the Defender of the Marriage Bond, who has charge of all disputed matrimonial cases; and the Rural Deans, who are pastors in country districts charged with the supervision in minor details of several neighboring parishes.

Candidates for the priesthood must have been born in lawful wedlock and must follow a six years' theological and philosophical course in a seminary after making the ordinary classical studies of a collegiate education. A priest must be twenty-four years old before he can be ordained, and a Bishop thirty years at his consecration. At his ordination a priest takes a vow of celibacy and the one of obedience to the Bishop in whose diocese he locates. The diocese is bound to support him as long as he lives in it and is in good standing. If he has no parish charge he is supported

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

out of a fund made up of contributions of $10 a year from each parish. Recent immigration has brought here about 300,000 Ruthenian Catholics of the Greek Rite. Among these some of the priests are married, this custom being tolerated among the Orientals but not among the Latins. They recognize the Pope as the head of their Church and are subject to the Bishops in whose dioceses they reside. No Catholic, however, may pass from one Rite to another without special permission from Rome, and only the gravest necessity makes it lawful for a priest of one Rite to administer the sacraments to a person of another Rite. A Bishop who resides in Philadelphia has recently been appointed by the Pope to look after their special interests. Two other Bishops care for the Poles, Huns and other Slavs.

The expenses of the ecclesiastical students at the seminaries are defrayed by the diocese, each parish sending to the fund for this purpose the proceeds of a collection made annually. Priests in the street wear the distinctive dress of their calling. They cannot go, according to diocesan rules, to races nor to the theatre. A priest cannot sue in a court concerning a temporal affair until it is impossible to settle the matter otherwise. If he brings matters of Church discipline into a civil court, he incurs a special excommunication. In the house ecclesiastics wear a long garment reaching to the ground called a cassock. For priests it is black; for Bishops and the Monsignori it is purple; for Cardinals red, and for the Pope white. The three-cornered cap worn by the clergy, the biretta, matches the cassock in color.

Priests who live in community and follow a special rule of life are called "regulars" and belong to the various Orders. Each of these Orders is separate in itself, and has different purposes and rules for its members, as well as a different dress or habit. These ecclesiastics take a vow of poverty as well as that of chastity and obedience. All their goods are owned in common. The Jesuits, contrary to the commonly accepted idea, based on the stage and fiction variety of the Order, cannot accept any ecclesiastical honors or preferment. If they do, they at once cease to be members of the Order. The "Jesuit in disguise" living in the world, and the layman Jesuit, are other fictions; and there never was, and never could be, such a thing as a female Jesuit.

Members of the other Orders, however, can take ecclesiastical

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

dignities without ceasing to be members of these bodies. Bishops who belong to any of these Orders, when promoted, wear cassocks that are the color of the habit or distinctive dress of the community. It is for this reason that Mgr. Falconio, the Apostolic Delegate, who is a Franciscan, wears gray silk in place of the purple of his rank as Archbishop. Some of the Orders are given charge of parishes by the Bishops. In this connection they are subject to him in what relates to purely parochial matters. The headquarters of most of the great Orders is in Rome, where the Father-General and his executive staff reside. The growing influence of the Church in the United States is shown by the fact that several of these high officials have come from this side of the Atlantic, and among the lieutenants of all are men selected for their knowledge of customs and conditions here. Father Martin, the recently deceased General of the Jesuits, was the first to have an American among the five "Assistants" who govern the Order. This official was Father Rudolph J. Meyer, a native of St. Louis, and he was the director of the English-speaking Jesuits of the whole world.

There are now forty-three Orders of men and one hundred and nine communities of women bound by the vows of regular religious life living in the United States. Of the communities of men, ten are communities of what are usually called "Brothers." They are not priests in Holy Orders and do not seek ordination, but live in community under the three vows of poverty, chastity and obedience. Their usual occupation is teaching in the schools. Their membership is about 5,000.

In the regular Orders, there are besides the priests also Brothers who are not ordained, but live in the community under its rule. They do the manual work of the house as their special avocation, while following the spiritual life also.

The communities of women, the nuns or Sisters, have a membership of about 50,000 and aid the clergy in the schools and charitable institutions. Each of their associations is distinct in itself and has no affiliation or relation to any other. Some are strictly cloistered and never leave the convent enclosure, nor mingle with the outside world, and lead a life of prayer and contemplation. The majority, however, do not observe such strict rules, and in their duties as teachers and nurses have a more active participation in the life around them. Each community

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

governs itself and elects its own officers under the supervision of the Bishop of the diocese and a chaplain or director appointed by him. He has no direct control, however, over the individual members, who, as among the men, are subject immediately to their own superiors. Each Order has what is called a "Cardinal Protector" at Rome, who acts as a sort of attorney for it in looking out for its interests before the ecclesiastical courts or elsewhere. These Sisters and nuns take no part in ecclesiastical ceremonies. The rule of the Church is very strict against women assuming any ministerial functions in the liturgical ceremonies. In this connection the enforcement by the present Pope of the canons excluding women from church choirs will be remembered. Female priests or preachers are absolutely impossible in the Catholic view. The different dresses or habits which the Sisters assume are a mere matter of taste on the part of the founders of each Order, who in this wish to take on the badge of humility and disregard of worldly vanities.

There is no "Church member," as the term is understood among Protestant denominations, recognized in the Catholic body. The Church claims in its full membership every baptized soul of every age and condition of life. The laity have many pious sodalities or confraternities, branches of which exist in every parish, and at least twenty national organizations, growing in numbers and efficiency every year, all working for the spiritual, intellectual, moral and social benefit of their own members and of the country at large. No layman, however, is authorized to assume sacerdotal prerogatives in Church ministrations. The law that restricts ministerial function to the recipients of Holy Orders is rigidly enforced and obeyed. The great charity organization is the St. Vincent de Paul Society, which dispenses thousands to the needy poor without the drawback of a big salary list. The members contribute their services free and many of the ideas of their system have been adopted by the experts in the modern machinery of organized charity and trained philanthropy. A National Federation of Catholic Societies has recently been organized which is intended to make their concrete influence available for the promotion and protection of Catholic interests. The private schools and charitable institutions which Catholics support with such favorable results are object-lessons in civic economy. It is not true that Catholics are opposed to the public-school system

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

as such. Their contention is that an education divorced from religious teaching is not complete or adequate. Therefore, as this essential is lacking in the school system supplied by the state, they feel bound in conscience to provide one of their own in which religion will find its proper place. Their hope is that in time their fellow citizens will, in justice, allow them out of the public taxes levied for educational expenses such proportion for results as their free schools show and as is the custom in Germany and elsewhere. No priest can publish a book touching on faith or morals and have it regarded as orthodox unless it bears the official sanction of his Bishop. No member of a religious Order can publish a work without the approval of his superior.

Nearly one-half of the great army of immigrants arriving in our ports every week are Catholics; hence, for them and those who have preceded them, has come the necessity of organizing parishes on racial lines which, wherever possible, are placed in charge of priests of the people's own nationality. Italian is now one of the regular studies in most of the seminaries, and a special training-school for Italian priests for the American missions has been organized in Italy. Similar effort is being undertaken for the Poles and Slavs. Experience with the Germans indicates that racial parish lines hardly survive the second generation, so certain is the assimilation of the foreign element into the general body politic.

All Catholic cemeteries are owned by the Church. Plots in them are not sold outright. Merely the privilege of sepulture, which is revokable at the will of the authorities, is given for the fees paid. This money, after the necessary expenses of the cemetery are met, must be spent for charitable or religious purposes. Cemeteries cannot be managed as profit-making corporations. Denial of burial within consecrated ground is regarded as one of the severest penalties the Church has enacted for recalcitrant members.

In the losses which the Church has sustained in the United States in the past century, a considerable proportion is due to mixed marriages. The Church gives reluctant consent to such unions and strips the ceremony of every detail of dignity. It cannot be performed in a church, and the priest officiating cannot impart the usual wedding blessing of the ritual, or wear any of the sacred vestments with which he is clothed when both

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

parties are Catholics. He merely stands as the official witness to the formal contract of matrimony entered into by the two parties interested. A dispensation for the marriage must also be secured from the Bishop, acting as the representative of the Pope, and before this is granted the non-Catholic must sign a written stipulation that there shall be no interference with the religious practices of the Catholic party, and that all children born of the union shall be brought up Catholics. The Catholic position against divorce for any cause is too well known to need more than a reference. No priest will marry people who are strangers to him; nor a couple from another parish without notice to their pastor. Banns must be called in church three times before the ceremony, unless a dispensation is secured from the Chancellor of the diocese acting for the Bishop. The ceremony is hedged about with many regulations that must be complied with to make it canonical.

On all sides it is apparent that much of the prejudice, mistrust and apprehension that once marked the attitude of many of their fellow citizens towards Catholics and their Church has given way to appreciation of its position, confidence in its loyalty and a sincere desire on the part of every intelligent American that all its force should be used as a spiritual leaven in the community against all that is sham in ethics, dangerous in philosophy and subversive in political economy.

THOMAS F. MEEHAN.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

ELECTION OF UNITED STATES SENATORS BY THE PEOPLE.

BY EMMET O'NEAL.

THE division of the legislative department into two separate and independent branches was so strongly recommended by the teachings of political history and the unequivocal language of experience, that it obtained the general approval of the Convention that framed the Constitution of the United States. From the earliest records of time, from the history of every government, the great political truth had been deduced that a single legislative assembly had always encroached upon constitutional rights, had always gradually absorbed all power, and had uniformly terminated its career in a legislative oligarchy, which united in itself all the extremes of bad government.

Yet, although there was no division of sentiment as to the necessity of two chambers, in the organization of the Senate the widest and apparently most irreconcilable conflict of sections, interests and opinions was developed. The small States were unwilling to consent to a Senate which gave greater representation and a preponderating influence to the large States. So bitter was the struggle that it seemed probable at one time that the Convention would adjourn without completing its labors. It was at this critical period in its history that Franklin offered his celebrated motion that the deliberations of the Convention be opened with prayer; and the agreement which was so soon afterwards reached on questions which had provoked the widest differences of opinion gave basis for the claim, made by some, that divine guidance was evident in the subsequent deliberations of the Convention.

Certain it is that the local jealousies, the struggle of interests, the conflict of sections and the selfish and intolerant feeling

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

which had so often been manifested gave place to a spirit of conciliation and compromise, and a broader and deeper national sentiment which speedily composed faction and secured united action.

The Senate of the United States has been termed the masterpiece of the Convention. Its creation was not the result of previously formed plans. Emerging from the deliberations of the Convention as the result of compromises made between sovereign and independent States, vested with both legislative and executive functions, its formation was less the result of theory than, in the language of its framers, "of a spirit of amity and of mutual deference and concession, which the peculiarity of the situation of the United States rendered indispensable."

Three schemes presented themselves to the Convention as to the mode of appointment of Senators; one was by the legislature of each State; another was by the people thereof; and a third was by the other branch of the National Legislature, either directly or out of a secret nomination. The last scheme met with no support, nine States voting against it and one being divided. The second scheme, of an election by the people, met with as little favor. The first scheme, that of an election by the legislature of each State, prevailed by a unanimous vote.

Mr. Bryce, in his "American Commonwealth," said:

> **"The method of choosing the Senate by indirect election has excited the admiration of foreign critics, who have found in it a sole and sufficient cause of the excellence of the Senate as a legislative and executive authority."**

Such also, until of late years, seems to have been the American opinion; but careful observers of political tendencies cannot have failed to notice that, for the past decade or more, a movement towards more direct action by the people, acting in their primary capacity in matters of legislation as well as the selection of public officials, has made itself manifest. Although the Senate has made itself eminent and respected, and has maintained an intellectual supremacy over the other co-ordinate branch of the legislative department; although it has fulfilled the ardent hopes and verified the profound wisdom of its creators by its ability to check what has been termed the "democratic recklessness" of the House on the one hand, and the tendency to Executive usur-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

pation on the other; has performed all its functions with marked ability, patriotism and efficiency; and has drawn into its ranks the most distinguished men who have entered public life, yet in recent years a powerful movement has been growing to destroy the very feature which, in the judgment of all former students and critics, has been the chief cause of its excellence—*the indirect election of its members.*

The steady growth and increasing strength of this movement is one of the most significant manifestations of modern political tendencies. The truth of this observation was forcibly illustrated a few years ago, when the House of Representatives, without debate, passed a resolution to submit to the States an Amendment making Senators elective by direct vote of the people.

Is the growth in popular favor of this method of electing Senators due to a loss of faith in the wisdom of the Constitution-makers and to an honest conviction that it would elevate the tone of the Senate and increase its efficiency and usefulness? Or is it but a manifestation of the advance of that spirit which, pretending to be democratic, would ignore the checks and balances of the Constitution, and subject every department of the Government to direct popular control? Have the lurid headlines of yellow journalism as to the treason of the Senate—the irresponsible utterances of those whose sorry rôle is to pander to the morbid appetite for the sensational—so affected the public mind that the American people are ready to welcome any change, however radical?

Does the support which has been given to the suggestion of a method of electing Senators which would essentially change the character of the Senate as conceived by the framers of the Constitution, indicate a popular endorsement of the charges which have been made, that the Senate had from its formation failed to meet the just expectations of the people, that it had of recent years become the citadel of corporate power and of "predatory wealth," and that the State legislatures had proven themselves unfit to remain longer the depositories of the power vested in them by the Constitution?

Whatever may be the causes that have conspired to create this dissatisfaction with the method of electing Senators provided by the Constitution, it is clear that the advocates of the proposed change have become so arrogant and intolerant, that he who would

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

challenge its wisdom or combat the arguments offered in its support incurs the risk of being classed as a traitor to the interests of the people, and denounced as the paid and selfish advocate of corporate greed.

Yet, if the proposed change of the Constitution is not supported by reason and justified by experience, if it would weaken our institutions, if the success of its advocacy has so far been due to selfish mandates of political expediency and is but the manifestation of popular unrest, if it has enjoyed temporary favor because its opponents have been seduced into a credulous silence and its advocates have been afraid to submit for public review the arguments in its favor, instead of deserving censure, he who exposes the folly of this change and the fatal consequences which would ensue from its success would be entitled to the thanks of all who desire to see our free institutions preserved unimpaired from the assaults of fanaticism and error.

While the opponents of this change may console themselves with the reflection that it has little prospect of being incorporated into a Constitutional Amendment, on account of the inherent and almost insurmountable difficulties which confront those who seek to amend our fundamental law, it must not be overlooked that this demand for the election of Senators by a direct vote of the people has become so powerful in many States as to practically nullify the provisions of the Constitution. By indirect methods, by party conventions and caucuses, and by the system of primary elections which prevails in many States, United States Senators are now in increasing numbers selected by direct vote of the people, and, even where the primary election system is not found, it is seldom that anything but a reduced freedom of choice remains in the State legislature.

A forcible illustration of this tendency may be found in the action of the Democratic party in Alabama. In 1906, the State Democratic Executive Committee ordered a primary election for the nomination of two United States Senators. At the same primary, they provided that two alternates, termed in common parlance "Senators-in-waiting," or "Senatorial pall-bearers," should be nominated by the popular vote; these alternates to be appointed by the Governor to fill any vacancy that might occur by reason of the death or resignation or other disability of the two Senators to be nominated and subsequently elected.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

To make effective this unique and gruesome plan, the Committee required that the candidates for the nomination of Governor to be selected by the same primary should sign a written pledge to appoint to the first vacancy that might occur the alternate receiving the highest vote, and to the second vacancy the alternate with the next highest vote. In the event of the candidates for Governor declining to abdicate their Constitutional power, and sign the pledge, their names were to be omitted from the ticket to be voted at the primary, which under the law governing primaries in Alabama the State Committee alone had power to print and circulate. This arbitrary rule left the candidates for Governor no alternative but to sign the pledge or retire from the contest or bolt the party.

Another singular provision of the plan was that, while the candidates for Senator were required to receive the votes of a majority of the counties in the State, the alternates could be nominated by a bare plurality of the popular vote.

This plan is entitled to the distinction of being the first instance in the political history of the country where the Chief Executive of a State was coerced, by the arbitrary rules of a party committee, to abdicate one of the most important functions of his great office. He was forced in advance of his nomination to surrender a power vested alone in him by the Constitution of the United States. A more perfect system of party tyranny could not well be conceived.

By its repudiation of the Constitutional method of electing United States Senators, this plan not only manifested a mistrust of the legislature, but, what was more remarkable and significant, it evinced an utter want of confidence in the capacity of the Governor of the State to exercise wisely and properly a grave and important Constitutional duty.

It is evident, therefore, that the dominant political party in Alabama, not content to await the adoption of a Constitutional Amendment, has already proceeded, by its system of primary elections and party rules, to withdraw both from the legislature and the Chief Executive of the State, their Constitutional power to elect and appoint United States Senators. Not only Alabama, but a number of other States, in obedience to party policy or party demand, have abrogated the scheme of indirect election of Senators provided by the Constitution.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

In order, however, to reach correct conclusions on this important question, it is necessary to examine briefly the origin of this demand for a change in our fundamental law, and the causes which have created it.

The demand for the election of Senators by direct vote of the people was first voiced in the platform of the National or People's party, in 1884. This platform demanded the reduction of the term of Senators by one-half and their election by a direct vote of the people. The same plank appeared in the subsequent platforms of the People's, or as it was afterwards called the Populist, party.

It was not till 1900 that the Democratic party, which in the contest in 1896 had practically absorbed the Populist party, yielded to the same demand and adopted the following plank in what was known as the Kansas City platform: "We favor an amendment to the Federal Constitution providing for the election of United States Senators by a direct vote of the people."

In view of these facts, no one can in fairness deny that the Populist party was the pioneer in this movement, or in justice withhold from it the meed of praise to which it is entitled for first discovering that the framers of the Constitution made a serious error in committing the election of Senators to the legislatures of the States.

The Populist party was composed of an amalgamation of the Greenback, Socialist and other political organizations. While its membership was largely composed of sincere and earnest men, its theories challenged every principle of sound economics and repudiated the fundamental doctrines on which our institutions were based. It believed that the United States was a government based on population, that numbers were its only element and a numerical majority its only controlling power. Hence, it believed that that system of government which obeyed the voice of the numerical majority was the wisest and best—an absolute democracy, without check or Constitutional limitation. This is conclusively shown by the policies advocated—"the initiative and referendum," the sub-Treasury, election of Senators, President, Vice-President and the Federal judges by direct vote of the people. A centralized and consolidated government, paternal in its character and socialistic in its doctrines, was the Populistic conception of the highest type of popular institutions. The

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

checks and balances which the Constitution had so carefully and wisely provided were to the Populist "a foolishness and a stumbling-block."

The Populist and other similar political organizations boldly denounced representative government. They did not hesitate to proclaim that experience for over a hundred years had shown that our system of vesting the entire law-making power in representatives had in its practical operation disfranchised the people; that from it had sprung all the abuses and corruption of government, and that the only remedy was to abolish the representative system by securing through the "initiative and referendum" the submission and adoption of all laws and public measures by direct vote of the people. Direct action by the people in all departments of the Government was the remedy they offered for all existing evils. The overthrow of the Constitutional method of electing Senators was but one step in this propaganda of reform. Their ultimate aim was the complete subversion of our whole system of representative government.

The practical absorption by the Democratic of the Populist party, in 1896, to a very considerable extent changed the character of both, creating a new party, which, while retaining the Democratic name, gave the stamp of Democratic approval to many of the doctrines and theories of the Populist organization. Yet, while many of the false and pernicious theories of Populism found lodgment in Democratic thought and expression in Democratic platforms, that great party is still true to its fundamental principles. If, "in moments of error and alarm," it has wandered from them, it is confidently believed that it will under the influence of an aroused Democratic conscience yet retrace its steps and "regain the road which alone leads to peace, liberty and safety."

But the question whether such a change is desirable can best be answered by a brief examination of the aims for which the Senate was created and the purposes it was designed to accomplish. These have been answered by James Madison, one of the greatest of the Constitution-makers, and may be summarized as follows:

1. The qualifications proposed for a Senator, as distinguished from a Representative, consist in a more advanced age and a longer period of citizenship. Their appointment by the State

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

legislature is recommended by the double advantage of favoring a select appointment, and of giving to the State governments such an agency in the formation of the Federal Government as most secures the authority of the former, forming a convenient link between the two systems.

2. Equality of representation in the Senate, the result of a compromise between the opposite pretensions of the large and small States. This being a compound republic, partaking both of the national and federal character, the government ought to be founded on a mixture of the principles of proportional and equal representation. This equality of representation was a Constitutional recognition of that portion of sovereignty remaining in the individual States, and an instrument for preserving that residuary sovereignty. Another advantage accruing from this ingredient of the Senate is the additional impediment it furnishes against improper acts of legislation. No law can be passed without a concurrence both of a majority of the people and a majority of the States. Excess of law-making is one of the diseases to which republics are most liable.

3. The Senate doubles the security of the people by requiring the concurrence of two distinct bodies in any schemes of usurpation and perfidy. The necessity of such a safeguard is indicated by the propensity of all single and numerous assemblies to yield to the impulses of sudden and violent passion, and to be led by factious leaders into intemperate and pernicious legislation. To correct this infirmity in legislation, the Senate is made less numerous than the House, and by its mode of selection and its longer tenure of office more independent. It secures a body of men who possess a more profound acquaintance with the objects and principles of legislation and government than can be expected of the other House, composed of men called from private pursuits, and generally continued in office for a short time, and led by no permanent motive to devote the intervals of public occupation to a study of the laws, the affairs and the comprehensive interests of their countrymen.

4. Such a body as the Senate prevents too great a mutability in the public councils which might arise from a rapid succession of new members. Practically one-half of the Representatives are changed at every election, and from this change of men must proceed a change of measures.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

5. The Senate creates a select body of men with a due sense of national character. While it undergoes an unceasing process of gradual renewal, it does not change all at once, and is, therefore, a stable and permanent body and obtains the respect of foreign governments by maintaining an enlightened, wise and continuous policy, not subject to constant change. Being less numerous and changeable than the House, it results that a sensible degree of the praise and blame of public measures is the portion of each individual Senator. Invested with a durable public trust, they are more considerate of the effect of their measures as viewed by foreign nations and by the States of the Union, than would be a more numerous and changeable body, with a shorter tenure and selected directly by the people.

6. The Senate creates an additional body in the legislative department with sufficient permanency to provide such measures as require continued attention. It creates an institution which is necessary as a defence to the people against their own temporary errors and delusions.

All these objects which Mr. Madison has so forcibly outlined, the Senate has more or less perfectly attained. For over a century its membership has enrolled most of the illustrious names in American history. It has not, as Hamilton feared, lost its Constitutional authority by reason of the greater force and power of the immediate representatives of the people, but, on the contrary, has won the public confidence by its sustained intellectual supremacy, its patriotism and devotion to the public interests.

Unlike the House, it has preserved the freedom of debate and amendment, and has not surrendered its powers to the autocratic rule of its presiding officer. It has furnished a salutary and efficient check against hasty, rash and reckless legislation, has guarded the residuary rights of the States and curbed Executive usurpation. In all free governments, the cool, deliberate, mature judgment of the people will and should ultimately prevail. But there are periods in public affairs when, influenced by the misrepresentations or delusions of ignorant and misguided men, misled by false and pernicious theories, or yielding to some prejudice or passion, or lured from the paths of justice and rectitude by some popular impulse, "the people may call for measures which they themselves will afterwards be the most ready to lament and condemn."

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

In such critical moments, says Mr. Madison, how salutary will be the influence of such a body of men as compose the Senate, to check the misguided career of public opinion, "and to suspend the blow meditated by the people against themselves, until reason, justice and truth can regain their authority over the public mind."

The lessons of history warned the framers of the Constitution against the danger and folly of entrusting the legislative power to a single assembly. To maintain the real balance intended by the Constitution, some check had to be provided, and hence they formed the Senate, a co-ordinate branch of equal authority but different organization, possessing an independent negative upon the doings of the House. It is difference in organization, the indirect election of its members, which is in fact the Senate's most distinguishing feature, upon which largely depends the check on the action of the other House it was designed to accomplish. Removed one degree from the people by the method of selection, the members of the Senate are less liable to be swayed by sudden and temporary gusts of passion and excitement, and are more independent because the legislatures by which they are elected have ordinarily ceased to exist when their successors are chosen. Yet if the terms of office, the qualifications and the method of their election were similar to those of the House, it is evident that the check against all the evils of sudden and strong excitement, rash or dangerous legislation, which the framers of the Constitution designed to secure, would be either lessened or destroyed.

Since the adoption of the Constitution, fifteen Amendments have been made to that instrument. All these Amendments were limitations on the power of the majority, "restraints on the people's will, to protect the people's rights."

The proposed change is the very first serious effort ever made to alter the very framework of the Constitution, to break down the barriers which distinguish the Senate from the House, and to create two legislative chambers whose only practical difference will be in the tenure of the members. The principal argument offered in support of this change is that it will make the Senate more responsive to the popular will.

If this is the purpose to be accomplished, it would logically follow that the other demand of the Populist platform, that the

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

terms of Senators be reduced one-half, is equally entitled to support. The shorter the terms, the more frequent would be the elections, and hence the stronger would be the effect of public opinion. Elected directly by the people every two or three years, the Senate would quickly respond to every breeze of popular opinion—the madness, folly or passion of the hour; it would no longer check or correct hasty or inconsiderate legislation by the House; it would no longer secure that calm deliberation and consideration of every public measure so necessary to wise and just government. The Senate would act as the House acts; it would be led by the same common influences of ambition, of intrigue or passion, to the same disregard of the public interests, the same indifference to and prostration of private rights. Having secured a Constitutional Amendment reducing the tenure of office and making Senators elective by direct popular vote, the next step in the propaganda of reform would logically be the introduction and adoption of the system of "initiative and referendum." All legislation being initiated by the people, the only remaining function of the Congress would be the reference of practically all matters of legislation back to the people for their approval or rejection at the polls. The reign of Populism and the utter prostration of representative government would be complete.

Mr. Calhoun, whose profound knowledge of the true theories of government no one can deny, said:

> "It may be said that the very *beau ideal* of a perfect government is the government of the majority acting through a representative body, without check or limitation on its powers; yet, if we may test this theory by reason and experience, we shall find that, so far from being perfect, the necessary tendency of all governments based upon the will of an absolute majority, without constitutional check or limitation of power, is to faction, corruption, anarchy and despotism; and this whether the will of the majority be expressed directly through an assembly of the people themselves or by their representatives."

It has been said that the framers of the Constitution, by providing for the selection of United States Senators by the legislatures of the States, showed a mistrust of the people. If mistrust of the people means that they were opposed to a government based simply on the rule of the majority, without Constitutional check or limitation of power, such as the pure democracies of

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

the Grecian states, the charge is true. The men who framed the Constitution of the United States had a genius for constitution-making, such as has been possessed by no other age of the world. They were profound students of history, ancient and modern. They were free from party bias, passion and prejudice. They had accomplished successfully a great revolution against the greatest military and naval power of the age. They were of English stock, but bred under new conditions; they had inherited as their birthright a love of liberty and a hatred of oppression. History had taught them that no government which was based on the absolute rule of the numerical majority, without Constitutional limitations on power, whether the action of that government was expressed by the people acting *en masse* or by representation, had ever lasted a single generation. They were laying the foundations of a government to endure for all time, a government of laws, and not of men. It has been truly said that no body of men ever gathered together in history had a sublimer trust in the wisdom and the eternal capacity of the people for self-government. "It was the immediate action of the people they deprecated. It was final and absolute self-control and self-government which they ordained and secured."

But it is seriously claimed that the legislatures of the States are too often composed of men without experience and training, with little knowledge of national affairs, and therefore incompetent to make wise selections—too often swayed by the arts of the demagogue—obeying the behests of party bosses and machine politicians, dominated by corporate power or the selfish greed of special interests, often corrupt and therefore unfit to exercise so important a function as the selection of a United States Senator.

If this indictment were true, it would be a confession that the people were incapable of self-government. The members of the legislatures of the different States are the agents and direct representatives of the people, and if it be true that as a whole they are incompetent, unworthy and corrupt, it would follow that the masses of the people from whom they spring, and from whom they are selected, were also either corrupt or criminally indifferent to their interests and liberties.

It is not true that the men who represent the sovereignty of the States, who make the laws that protect us in our lives and

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

property and most sacred interests, who collect and disburse our taxes, and frame our civil and criminal laws, are corrupt and unworthy. There may be isolated cases where members of the legislature have betrayed the interests of the people, but the great mass of the legislatures of the forty-six States of the Union have been the picked and chosen men of the communities from which they come, and have been "honest, wise, faithful and just." The statute-books of these forty-six commonwealths are without a stain and are replete with wise and beneficent laws, under which the States have grown into great and powerful commonwealths. It was a great statesman, from whose lips words of idle praise never fell, who said: "The statute-books of these commonwealths can be read by the patriot without a blush. I am not afraid to compare them with the two hundred and fifty parliaments through which for eight hundred years the freedom of England has broadened slowly down from precedent to precedent."

The member of the legislature, when he casts his vote for a Senator, acts under the solemn responsibility of his oath of office, in the exercise of an important official duty. As a rule, he endeavors to select that candidate who by reason of experience, public service or acknowledged ability, is most fit to be elected to this exalted station. That the selections have been wise is conclusively shown by the high character which the Senate, for over a hundred years, has sustained for ability and statesmanship. If, however, the method now proposed be adopted, it would necessarily result in substituting for a body of picked and selected men, acting under the responsibility of their oath of office, party conventions and party primaries. Where the convention system prevails this important function would be performed by a body of men who act under no sense of responsibility or oath of office, who are selected only for a day and who frequently owe their seats as delegates not so much to merit and capacity as to party zeal and service. What has been the result where the direct primary election system has prevailed? That system has made money the most potent factor and wealth the recognized touchstone of political success. It has made knowledge of the science of government, statesmanship and oratory of less importance than skill in the arts of political management and organization. Compare those who have won the Senatorial

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

prize under this system with those who were elected by the Constitutional method, and there can be but one answer.

The election of Senators by popular vote would secure to the larger cities and masses of population an undue influence and preponderance and would substitute pluralities for majorities. Such a radical change in one of the great departments of the Government would soon spread to the entire system. The reasons which demand it, when carried to their logical conclusion, would lead to the election by direct popular vote and by popular majorities of the President, Vice-President and the entire Federal judiciary. The next step that would inevitably follow would be the placing of all elections under national control, with the result that the rights of the States would be overthrown and a consolidated government erected on the ruins of our beautiful Federal system.*

In the better days of the Republic, before the mad passion for wealth and business success had seared the public conscience, such a proposition as is embodied in this demand for the election of Senators by popular vote, would have aroused a storm of discussion and debate. Yet to-day we see a great political party, which has ever claimed to be the loyal defender of the Constitution, incorporating, without debate, into its platform a demand which had its origin in the wild vagaries of Populism. So firmly has this Populistic doctrine become embedded in the Democratic creed that its recognized leaders accept and proclaim it as one of the most important articles of the Democratic faith.

It is nevertheless amazing that the Democracy of the South should join in this demand. At the close of the Civil War, when measures were pending in Congress which threatened to destroy her civilization and degrade and humiliate her people, with the civil rights and force bills about to be enacted, and the residuary rights of the States about to be overthrown, the South had no more loyal defenders than that small minority of Democrats in the Senate who, undismayed by the mad passions of the hour, stood at their post of duty and successfully arrested

* While this article was in preparation, on the 23rd of May, Senator Owen of Oklahoma offered in the Senate a joint resolution (number 91) providing for an Amendment to the Constitution to elect United States Senators by a direct popular vote. Mr. Depew of New York offered an amendment, *providing that all elections for Senators and Representatives shall be placed under national control, and that the qualifications of each voter shall be uniform throughout the United States.*

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

the tide of centralization which was about to submerge our institutions. The people of the United States can look back over a history resplendent for great achievements, but they can point to none with more pride than to the achievements of the Senate. In that arena has been fought and won the great battles of Constitutional liberty. There Webster and Hayne met in that great debate, on the issues of which the whole Republic hung with breathless interest. There Clay, the great Pacificator, introduced that compromise which stayed for years the conflict between the sections. There Webster delivered his great argument on the Constitution, with such convincing force, such sustained power of eloquence, such profound wealth of information and dramatic effect, that the occupants of the galleries, braving the rules of the Senate, rose *en masse* and proclaimed him the Defender of the Constitution. There Calhoun, with a knowledge of the philosophy and purposes of government never surpassed, with that deep learning, that wonderful power of analysis which enabled him to resolve the most complex subject into its component parts, and to erect thereon arguments which were unassailable, met and overthrew all the brilliant array of talent which the administration had mustered against him; and there he was borne in his dying hours, his great heart overcoming the frailties of his body, to make one last effort to stay the conflict which, with prophetic eye, he saw was almost inevitable. And when the great Constitutional debates which had been waged in that body for over a half century were referred to the arbitrament of arms, and when at the close of the conflict the tendencies of the time were rushing the Government upon the breakers of consolidation, there still stood in the Senate a small remnant of that great party which had for so many years controlled the destinies of the Republic and battled successfully for the preservation of our institutions. When the Amendments resulting from the war were being so framed as to transfer to the General Government the control of the suffrage and elections, it was that small minority of Democratic Senators who, though without power to defeat the Amendments, did control their form and prevented the delegation to the National Government of powers which had always been exercised by the States.

There George delivered that great speech in defence of the rights of the States to regulate and control the suffrage, which

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

was so logical and conclusive, so fortified by learning and argument and authority as to mark an era in constitutional history. It was there that the chivalric Lamar refused to obey the orders of the popular majority in his own State to vote contrary to his judgment on the silver question. There, recently, Alabama's two venerable Senators, believing that the rights of the States were being imperilled by Federal encroachments, defying the storm of popular sentiment which had swept over their own State as well as the country, cast two of the three votes recorded against the Hepburn Rate Bill.

For over a hundred years, amid all the storms of party passion, the rivalry and struggles of sections, the clamor of fanatical agitation, the Senate has maintained its distinctive features, calm, dignified, patriotic yet considerate, firm but not precipitate, constituting, as was designed by the Fathers of the Constitution, a model second chamber, interposing that delay which furnished time for reflection and deliberation, checking the evil effects of sudden and strong excitement and of precipitate measures, and protecting the country against the dangers and confusion which arise from the enactment of laws which did not reflect the calm judgment of the people but the temporary and transient folly or madness of the hour, and maintaining unimpaired the rights of the States and of the National Government. If the proposed change were effected, the division of the Congress into two branches would prove of no intrinsic value, for, elected by the same methods, influenced by the same motives, they would both but duplicate all the evils and dangers of a single legislative body.

It is time that all who love our free institutions should array themselves in opposition to a change which, whether effected by Constitutional method or party usage or custom, "will result in the overthrow of the whole scheme of the Senate, and in the end of the whole scheme of the National Constitution as designed and established by the framers of the Constitution and the people who adopted it."

EMMET O'NEAL.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

GENTLE SPEECH.

BY PRICE COLLIER.

In the heat of a political campaign, or at the time of an unexpected national sorrow, one is impressed with the enormous increase in the number of people who can hear and who can read. Education has at least done that. The readers of newspapers, and the listeners to public speaking, have increased out of all proportion to the increase in the population. There were never before so many people, moulded, informed, influenced by single individuals speaking to them and writing for them as to-day. This fact is so apparent that we might expect the study of simple English, for either public writing or public speaking, to be much in evidence. The increasing number of men and women of a certain intellectual training is adding rapidly to that consensus of the competent who are merely fatigued by rhetorical epilepsy, or by simian homiletics, and who judge a speaker, and fairly, to some extent at least, by his verbal righteousness. The day has not dawned yet, though there are streaks of light upon the horizon, when the man who has something to say will be more attractive even to the masses than the man who has something to yell.

The most effective speaking in England and in America to-day, and I mean by that the speaking that makes a social, political or religious difference, and not a mere social, political or religious stir, is done in England by Morley, Asquith, Rosebery, Balfour, Dilke, Scott Holland, Bishop Gore, Wilson; and in this country by such men as President Eliot of Harvard, Bishop Greer, Bishop Hall of Vermont, Governor Hughes of New York, and others—these names are chosen at random—all men of careful diction and matured thought.

Few people think of words as having a moral significance, or deem it to be a matter of morals, whether they speak well or ill,

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

or even so much as a matter of importance. And yet the world to-day is a web of speaking and writing as never before, and the indistinct, the indefinite, the inaudible are being more and more left behind.

It must be admitted at the start that there is no fixed standard of speech, no one perfect example of good English writing, any more than there is any one perfect standard of life among living men. Nor is good or bad English a mere matter of words and their mechanical arrangement; but it includes voice and gesture and intonation, and demands, not merely a rhetoric and a grammar on one's table, but a trained mind and a chastened heart back of the lips and tongue. To speak well or to write well can neither be learned of a schoolmaster nor be culled from a book. To speak well—and I mean by this to speak well not merely in public, but as friends among ourselves—is the final touch of a thorough training in morals, manners and experience. Indeed, I can fancy that the best English-speaking would be that of a man who should enter a room and speak so that you would only discover how charmingly he spoke after he had ceased and some one else had begun. One, too, whose manner, accent and pronunciation should be cosmopolitan and not provincial—that is to say, he would leave you guessing where he was educated, whether at Oxford, at Harvard, at Columbia or at the University of Virginia, and also at a loss to know whether he came from the South, North, East or West. Not only is that fine speech, but it is also fine breeding, for the Boston "a's," the New York "r's," the Philadelphia sweetness of guttural, and the Southern lack of interest in the consonants are all geographical sign-boards labelling a man's provinciality; and although I must agree with the majority of Americans and with Max O'Rell that there is nothing more to be desired than to be an American girl, I permit myself to say that it would add a touch of completeness even to that creation, were it possible for her to conceal the fact in speaking.

There is a superstition, even among those who should know better, that English can be bought at so much a lesson, and that not to say "between you and I" and "these sort," and the like, is the sum and substance of the whole matter. If this were true, who would be interested in the subject? It is because to speak well is to live well; it is because words are the children of the living, and the result of moral and mental training; it is because

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

the man or woman of distinguished and noble speech, attained thereto by means of far more complex aids than grammars or dictionaries, that the subject is worthy of consideration. For this mechanical part of the business is in a sense comparatively unimportant. Even Sydney Smith, Sheridan, Hallam, Whately, Carlyle, Macaulay, Shakespeare, Milton, Gibbon, Southey, Lamb, Landor, Walker of the dictionary, and Lindley Murray of the grammar, have bequeathed to us serious grammatical blunders. Even Matthew Arnold descended to this kind of criticism when he noticed a number of grammatical errors in Grant's Memoirs. It was unfortunate that Arnold should have attacked General Grant's book along these lines; for, in the course of that same criticism, Mr. Arnold perpetrates the following sentence: "Meade suggested to Grant that he might wish to have immediately under him Sherman, who had been serving with Grant in the West. He begged him not to hesitate if he thought it for the good of the service. Grant assured him that he had not thought of moving him, and in his Memoirs, after relating what had passed he adds, etc., etc." One might go far to find a wilder dance of personal pronouns than that; and, were we to judge the enlightened Arnold by that jumble of words, we should scarce be able to claim for him equality with some of the writers on our fawn-colored newspapers. Such a sentence as the one just quoted is, as are practically all such blunders, more a matter of morals than of mechanics, of confused thinking, than of careless writing. It is not only bad English, but it is untruthful, as untruthful indeed as the phrase that appeared in almost all our newspapers after the death of President McKinley: "the dead President," "the dead President's policy," etc., etc. No "dead President" ever had a policy; and, in case he had, it was a matter pertaining to eschatology rather than to politics. The absurdity of the mistake was the more notable, with a very much alive President about all the time. This use of "dead" for "deceased," and the application of the word "dead" to an office that cannot die, is pointedly illustrated by the clergyman who, at a funeral, alluded pathetically to the fact that he had often "dandled the corpse upon his knee."

English is not a cut-and-dried arrangement of words that one can learn as a Freshman crams history for an examination, but it is flexible, changing and adaptable. There is English for the slippered ease and cozy comfort of one's own fireside; there is the

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

style of speech suited to the glittering and uniformed function of fashion; there is the English of the pulpit, of the stage, of the platform, and not by any means one everlasting, unchanging correct form of speech, with which one must make love, deliver an oration, advertise for a cook, and tell fairy-stories.

Perhaps no sadder consequence of this conception of language as a fixed, hard process can be instanced than what may be called "fine English," fine English being, in short, inappropriate English. The very best examples of this are found among those whose manners are modelled upon cuts in fashion magazines, and small books on "Don't." But there are fine writers to be discovered, even where one would least expect it, as when the "Quarterly Review" speaks of boys as "the male progeny of human kind," or when the "Literary Gazette" calls an uncle "an avuncular guardian." Among such people, a fire is the "devastating element," money is a "pecuniary compensation," dancers are "votaries of Terpsichore"; if a crime cannot be found out it is "enveloped in obscurity"; a man who is first to do a thing "assumes the initiative"; instead of being put in prison one "is incarcerated"; instead of loving a woman one "is attached to her"; instead of dying one "expires"; instead of being buried one's "remains are deposited"; and at the end one's "disconsolate relict erects to him a monumental memorial."

Fine writers, and speakers too, delight in affectedly using French phrases. The rule, I think, is to use a foreign word or phrase only where English will not so well express what we wish to say—as, for instance, with the words *protégé, prestige, ménage, passée, ennui,* and the phrases, "*embarras de richesses,*" "*esprit de corps,*" "*tout ensemble*" and others, and even these may be better left alone. To such people, again, a horse doctor is a "veterinary surgeon," an author is a "literary gentleman," a "drummer" is a "commercial gentleman," a thief is a "light-fingered gentleman"; such people do not go to law, but they "institute legal proceedings"; they do not go to a doctor, but they "consult a medical adviser."

All this lies deeper than language. It is affectation; it is vulgarity; and these are matters pertaining to heart and mind and soul, and not to grammar and lexicon. Such words and phrases are like rouge on the cheeks, they color vividly the very defect that it was meant to conceal. They display the very igno-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

rance that the speaker attempts to disclaim; or, as Thomas Fuller, the author of the "History of the Worthies of England," says: "To clothe low creeping matter with high-flown language is not fine fancy, but flat foolery."

There is a distinction to be made, however, between this "fine style" and what Matthew Arnold calls aptly the "grand style." Let us quote a few verses which are in themselves an illustration of the grand style:

"In his cool hall with haggard eyes,
The Roman noble lay:
He drove abroad, in furious guise,
Along the Appian Way:

"He made a feast, drank fierce and fast,
And adorned his hair with flowers,
No easier and no quicker passed
The impracticable hours.

"The brooding East with awe beheld
Her impious younger world;
The Roman tempest swelled and swelled,
And on her head was hurled.

"The East bowed low before the blast,
In patient, deep disdain:
She let the legions thunder past,
And plunged in thought again."

These lines are what the grand style means, viz.: words with a stately rhythm, with a certain splendor of meaning, and moving with majestic step.

Strangely enough, Milton furnishes a sad example of an attempt at the "grand style" which falls to the level of the "fine style"; here it is:

"Look upon this, thy poor and almost spent and expiring church; leave her not a prey to these importunate wolves that wait and think long till they devour thy tender flock; these wild boars that have broke into thy vineyard, and left the print of their polluting hoofs on the souls of thy servants."

This passage is absurd, with its wolves "that wait and think"; and its wild boars that "leave the print of their polluting hoofs" are truly boars of the Nature Fakir. It is a striking illustration of how even the best writers mistake a big noise for splendid prose.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Milton was in the mood, when he wrote that, to refer you to the "mitigated affliction department," where, by the way, it is said he kept his daughters most of the time.

The only way to avoid this vulgarity of speech and writing is to be honest; never to juggle people into believing you can explain to them what you do not understand yourself, never to try to cover up a lack of ideas with heaps of words. As has been well said: A few large and vaguely understood words have played the part of the German allies at many a literary Waterloo. One is reminded of the rebuke administered by a foreign judge to the son of respectable parents who was convicted of the theft of some poultry: "Young man, you were blessed with a noble and exemplary father, who inculcated in your young mind the principles of honesty and virtue, and a pious mother who nightly offered up prayers for you: instead of which you go around stealing ducks!"

Every sin will express itself in language. You may know much of a man's character by attending to his conversation. The vain man ornaments his speech, uses big words in preference to little ones, colors his stories, exaggerates his circumstances, makes all his friends rich or noble, wise or witty. The mean man has his vocabulary stocked with the words that best portray his disposition—poor, paltry, contemptible, scurvy, cheap, trivial, insignificant chaff, froth, bubble, shabby, these are ever near his lips; while a man of larger mould will be as free with important, great, vital, weighty, good, first-rate, interesting, noble, generous, kind. Even a small list of words will tell almost as much about a man as his biography.

This matter of the grand style and the fine style, of mean men and noble men, is not language, but life; not grammar, but character. Byron could not conceal his littleness beneath his rhetoric, nor Johnson his blustering temper and sesquipedalian sententiousness, nor Swift his coarseness. It is not a question of English in any of these instances; it is a question of men. Johnson could not have written like George Herbert, because he lacked, not his English, but his sweet spirit. Or—further to illustrate what I began with, viz.: that English as a language is spiritual rather than mechanical—let me say that the man tells for more in language than the art. I do not mean by this to descend into the literary Hades of personality; not that at all. Only it seems to me that the Herbert style of man is more rare than the Swift

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

stamp of man, and that therefore the English of Herbert has a subtle flavor that no amount of art can compensate for.

Of course, this broad view of the question, that language is life, only applies to those who have the elements of the language well under control. But in a lesser degree even among the unread, and unskilful, the life of the man or woman will always protrude through his speech. His language will always to some extent be an indicator of his life. If you will go from Spenser and Shakespeare to Massinger and Fletcher and Webster, in English literature, you will find that the fall in language was accompanied also by a fall in life. If you will read Milton and then Pope, you will find the grandeur and repose of Milton in his life as well as in his language; you will find the hypocritical glibness and self-satisfaction in the life of Pope as well as in his language. Milton's was the righteousness of conscience and you read it in his lines. Pope's was the righteousness of geometry, and you find it mirrored in his stiff little verses.

You may carry this principle as a measuring rod and use it on the next man or woman you meet, and it will gauge them fairly well. The woman of superficial elegance of language, whose speech is a sandwich of expletives and French phrases, is very probably lacking in simplicity of manners and morals. The man of highfalutin' speech is very often a man of the same quality of thought. It is only hard to make people believe in simplicity of speech for the reason that they distrust the foundation of simplicity of speech, viz.: simplicity of life. So long as fine feathers attract attention more readily than the restraint of simplicity, just so long shall we have bombast and loudness in language instead of quiet force.

And this applies to that other part of language, voice and intonation. It is a mistake to suppose that one speaks correctly who does not speak agreeably. It were folly supreme in a rifleman to say that it made no difference about the barrel, the rifling of his weapon, so long as his bullet was perfect. It is as foolish to hold that, if your sentence be correct, it matters little how you fire it off. It always makes some difference, and often makes *all* the difference. When one says, for example, "Look out *there!*" you turn and look out of the window; when the emphasis is altered to "look *out,* there," you draw your head in to avoid the danger that was only expressed by the intonation. The difference is not always

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

so marked as that, but there is always a difference. Mere gentleness and distinctness of enunciation are a part of the use of words not to be underrated.

Foreigners tell us that our women are flagrantly guilty in this respect. From the schoolgirl in short frock, and pigtail adown her back, to the rulers over households with a retinue of servants to satisfy a prince, our women often make their conversation to consist of a series of modulated shrieks. And yet deafness is not universal, is not even common, in America. The mountains are as immovable, the sun as silent, the moon as quiet in her pace here as in Asia or Europe. There is no national rumble or roar that makes it necessary for men, women and children to shout in order to be heard. It may be perhaps the result of every new settlement's growing out of the bustle incident to our pounding, hammering and sawing to make ourselves homes.

But we of to-day have felled the forest of our wilderness, our sons no longer shoot wild beasts from "shacks" on the prairies, even Chicago is fifty years old, and we have no such excuses to give for our lack of the angel voice. And yet no one speaks English well who does not speak it agreeably to the ear. The ear is one of the pickets of the mind, and has more than we think to say about what shall enter the camp of the mind and how it shall enter. Among people of a certain class it is not only a privilege, but a duty, to add softness and simplicity and naturalness to life. It is for others to fell the trees, saw the logs and build the houses; it is for them to provide angels for the houses.

The dissatisfaction expressed against wealth and leisure by those who have them not, is due, in great part, to the fact that wealth and leisure sometimes neglect their duties to the world. We do not object to the idle absent-minded dreamer if he writes an "In Memoriam," a "Hamlet" or a "Père Goriot"; it is when he is slothful and a non-producer that we grow suspicious, and finally revolutionary, and pull down his palace.

Wherever wealth is gracious and simple, wherever leisure cultivates the qualities of speech and manner and mind, that a busier life leaves little room for, men assail them no more than they think of pulling down the stars because they only give light when they sleep. The man in the street is as sensitive to rough speech, vulgar manners, the ungracious and ill-timed expression of careless thinking, as is the student of these matters. He realizes that gentleness

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

is not a quality that resides in the nose. He understands, though perhaps dimly, that it is not the east wind, not the psalm-singing ancestors, not any peculiar laryngeal formation, that is at fault. It is the heart, the lack of thoughtfulness, lack of that most subtle charity of sympathy with others which is not a set of rules, but the perfume of a life.

Wealth and leisure are revealing themselves daily, by their speech, to scores of people who take note of them, and who are influenced favorably or otherwise by what they hear. Speech thus becomes a factor in the economics of discontent. "Is this what the rich make of money and leisure?" people say, as they hear the malicious simian chatter of some women, the ribald speech of some men, the coarse guffaws and bluster of others.

To those who are already envious and sore at what seems to them cruel inequalities, this uncultivated speech must go far to make them feel that the difference of station is solely artificial, a barrier of greater possessions, and these not always becomingly acquired. It is, then, perhaps, not too much to say that speech alone becomes a powerful medium for the propagation of social good or evil.

It was well said by a young orator, in a recent municipal campaign, that every lady who went below Fourteenth Street to canvass for votes among the poor would lose more votes in a visit, than he and his party could win for the same cause in a month. In brief, he knew that their speech and manners would create hostility, and he was brave enough to say so; and what a curious commentary it is upon this subject.

There is no surer sign of our increasing intelligence as a people than the change of fashion in our public orators. We are rapidly recovering from that infantile intellectual stage when it is thought that frothing at the mouth is the only genuine form of the divine afflatus. We are gradually coming to understand that the hurricane bombast of the revivalist only proves him wanting in the gentleness and serenity of spirit of Him he proclaims, and is the result, not of true enthusiasm, but of ignorant egotism. The windmill style of oratory lingers in the South and West, and is greeted with applause now and again in the East, as an amusing relic of barbarous rhetorical times; but it carries ever less and less weight.

Americans have become, in a word, much more sensitive to the

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

significance of speech, whether private or public. Even the details of scholarly care in speech are far more frequent in our speakers of to-day than was the case twenty-five years ago. Words like "desultory," "magnanimous," "resiliency," "hocuspocus," "buncombe," "gerrymander" and a host of others, are nowadays used with the precision that comes of an etymological acquaintance with them. One still hears "tabernicle" instead of "tabernacle," and more often than not "foward" for "forward," and "often" instead of "offen" with the emphasis on the "t"; and the "a" broadly pronounced, as it should not be in the last syllable of "circumstances," but of these matters there is no end, and perhaps one may as well hold with Truthful James upon this question that:

> "It's not a proper plan,
> For any scientific gent to whale his fellow man,
> And if a member don't agree with his peculiar whim,
> To lay for that same member for to put a head on him."

There is no scholastic harness that one can put on and thus disguise oneself. In the common occupations of life there is a working suit of speech, as there are rough working suits of clothes. To go about dressed up in "I do not," "I cannot," "do not you," and the like, is like marketing in point-lace and high-heeled slippers, or riding in plush velvet and waving plumes. One may be unaffected and simple in speech and still be accurate, and no one pays an audience or a friend a more delightful compliment than when he gives himself the trouble to attend to the daintiness of speech in addressing the one or conversing with the other.

These are not merely matters for the linguistic dandy, any more than attention to cleanliness and appropriate dress are effeminate. On the contrary, it is this we are driving at. No man who will not take pains with his speech can be depended upon to take pains with his thought. For the very reason, as was stated in the beginning, that so many in this country can hear and read understandingly we have a responsibility ever growing greater and greater. It is not far from criminal to color the minds of men with vituperation, with exaggerated epigrams, with scattering and sputtering denunciation, even though they be uttered with the prognathic emphasis of exhilarated prejudice. Back of such speech as this, sober-minded men know, there must exist excite-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

ment, not calm; a feverish desire to exploit oneself, rather than to explain a great cause. But even that matters little as compared to the wide-spread disorder it breeds in untrained minds. In the days when only a few heard and when only the few needed to be influenced, these methods defeated themselves; but to-day in this country hundreds of thousands misunderstand, and are led astray, by the effervescent speech which is born of loose thinking or not thinking at all.

"Leave to the tyro's hand
The limp and shapeless style;
See that thy form demand
The labor of the file.

"Paint, chisel, speak or write;
But that the work surpass,
With the hard fashion fight,
With the existing mass."

We have no quarrel with any man who has a cause to uphold, or a social or economic evil to oppose; but every patriotic American sees an enemy in the man who purposely uses language to engender blind strife. Were one not personally persuaded that, in an article of this kind, it is out of place to name names, it were an easy task to prove that the man of sober speech far surpasses the man of exciting phrases—has already surpassed him, indeed—in bringing about wholesome political and economic results. Slowly, but surely, it percolates through one layer to another of mankind that language itself takes on its clothing and color from the mind behind it. The man who stuns the nation with detonating phrases, and sprinkles his fellows with dropping sparks of many-colored insults, is gradually suspected of having a temperament as pyrotechnical as his words. No cause, no need, no danger, however imminent, demands sultry and poisonous speech.

Everybody is a gentleman nowadays; but, despite that social axiom, we all hug to our hearts each his own notion of who is and who is not the gentleman. One may doubt, however, whether any definition or any measurement is quite so sure or so universal as this of gentle speech. No stars nor garters can conceal the boor; no wealth, spread however thickly over all one has and is, conceals bad breeding; nor, on the other hand, can a threadbare coat or uninitiated manners conceal the kindliness, the care, the

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

gentleness of speech of the true gentleman. Let this not be an excuse for carelessness, however. St. Augustine writes somewhere: "Let not the artless simple brother think himself a holy man because he knows nothing." One recalls, too, in this connection, the rough preacher who, not far from Oxford, was wont to rail against mere learning, and who, after fulminating from a text of St. Paul on how good a man might be without much learning, reached his climax with the words: "My hearers, do you suppose St. Paul knew Greek?" It is because it is the life behind the language that is important that speech is of such grave consequence. "All great languages," says Ruskin, "invariably utter great things and command them; the breath of them is inspiration, because it is not only vocal but vital; and you can only learn to speak as these men speak by becoming what these men were." Or, as Emerson puts it: "Words are vascular; cut them and they will bleed."

Who can gainsay these things? And, if they be true, how guilty is the man of rash speech; and, if he be in high station, how dangerous, for he may bring disaster before his speech bewrays him. It is surely worth while to impress upon men, again and again, the value of gentle and careful speech. At no time, in no place, has the weight of responsibility been so great as here and now, in this democracy, upon those who are listened to and read.

We hear much, we read quickly, but as a nation we shall rue it, if we forget to be gentle in our speech. The social and economic and political value of this factor is being impressed upon us whether we will or no; and each man who tempers his own speech, and calls intemperate speech in others boldly by its right name, is not merely doing something for scholarship, but doing much for the redemption of his country from the evils of hot-headed speech.

"The shepherds heard it overhead,
The joyful angels raised it then,
Glory to heaven on high it said,
And peace on earth to gentle men."

PRICE COLLIER.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

THE LIMITS OF BRITISH GOVERNING CAPACITY.

BY BRITANNICUS.

It has of late become increasingly clear that Great Britain is nearing a crisis in her Imperial rule. The rise of an aggressive Nationalism in Egypt, the far more numerous and menacing tokens of unrest in India, have penetrated the British people with the consciousness that their relations with the races under their guardianship are taking on an acute and abnormal complexity. New problems are arising of a kind that the mere administrator hardly professes to gauge. A spirit is stirring among these dusky wards of Empire that at once puzzles and dismays their governors. Even with its outward manifestations they find it with each year, almost with each month, that passes, more and more difficult to cope; while its inner essence frankly eludes them. The novel forces of self-revelation and self-assertion that are making themselves felt by the Nile and the Ganges confront the rulers of India and Egypt with a riddle in political psychology that baffles and bewilders them. Their genius does not lie in the reading of the particular kind of enigma that is now propounded to them. They face it, boldly indeed to the eye, but not without an undercurrent of disquietude and apprehension. I propose in this article to state, in the broadest terms, the nature of the new problem in Imperial government that the British are called upon to deal with and to estimate their capacity for solving it.

If we take the normal course of British experience in the rulership of subject races, we see that it passes through two fairly well-defined phases. I am thinking now of countries like India, Egypt and the Malay States. In each of these territories there are, of course, local variations of such a character and ex-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

tent as to put any detailed examination of their conditions out of the question in such an article as this. But in all of them the two phases I have spoken of appear and reappear. The first phase is the Personal or Autocratic phase. A new country, inhabited by Orientals, comes into British hands. Great Britain enters it with certain fixed principles of policy and administration in her head—to derive from it no benefit that may not be shared in by any other nation on equal terms, to spend on the country all the revenue raised from it, to govern the natives rather in their interests than in her own, and to organize for the work of administration a stable, competitive, high-salaried, absolutely non-political civil service. Her great experience in Oriental government has taught her the folly of trying to "hustle" the East—the first and most difficult lesson that Americans will have to learn in the Philippines. She begins by imposing peace and establishing order. She brings home to the native mind two supreme facts—first, that whatever her display of force on the spot, there is always a power in the background that will be used if necessary; secondly, that British officials can be trusted to keep their word. It is something in dealing with Asiatics to have inculcated either lesson, but for final and comprehensive success, both are needed. The Dutch, after thirty years of struggle, have impressed neither upon the Acheenese; Americans in the Philippines have still to round off the military subjugation of the Archipelago by its moral conquest. There is no feature of British Imperialism more wholly honorable than its basis in character and its reputation for fair dealing. It has so worked upon the Oriental imagination that it embraces every casual traveller in the Orient who speaks English. The mere fact that he speaks the language of a people renowned for their uprightness, their good faith, their absolute fidelity to the spirit as well as the letter of the bond, is a passport, as every American tourist in the East can testify, to the esteem and confidence of the natives. It is the loftiest of all Great Britain's titles to glory, and perhaps the most permanent. Her visible Empire may pass away like other Empires, but the fame and influence of that particular type of character on which it rests are a monument that will not perish.

Peace, order and, on their heels, a hard-won trust are the initial landmarks of British rule. The history of the Malay

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

States will illustrate as well as any the processes by which they are evolved. When the British went to Perak some five and thirty years ago, the various States of the Peninsula conformed to the normal type of Mohammedan despotisms. The new rulers knew as little of the interior of the country as Americans in 1897 knew of the Philippines. They were white men going where, except for an occasional sportsman or explorer, white men had never been before; they were Christians dumped down among a Mohammedan populace; they came to alter and pull down in the midst of a people whose favorite proverb is, "Let our children rather than our customs die"; they represented all the horror of the new and unknown in a country whose inhabitants had a detestation of change bred into their very bones; and, finally, they went unarmed and with no visible support in the background into territories ablaze with anarchy, where the poorest native habitually carried from three to five weapons. Their reception varied from sullen suspicion to open hostility. A "punitive expedition," rigorously limited to its declared objects and withdrawn the moment those objects were attained, had to be organized to avenge the murder of the first British administrator who was appointed. After that single but sufficient demonstration of power, of purpose and of good faith, Perak gradually settled down in tranquillity and the other native States came slowly, one by one, under British protection. The bloodless revolution that has since been wrought in their conditions is one of the least known but most remarkable examples of British administration. But what I chiefly wish to emphasize is the fact that system at first had very little to do with it. The foundations were laid by the good sense, tact and patience of perhaps half a dozen Englishmen who were set down on the Peninsula as one might throw a dog into the sea and leave it to sink or swim. They had only a vague idea of the work before them, but they had the counterbalancing advantage of being versed in Asiatic lore, and in other posts they had proved themselves the men for rulership. Moreover, without exception, these men were gentlemen, both in the right and in the conventional sense. They went among the people, not as Olympian conquerors, but with that sympathetic, elder-brotherly, protecting feeling which centuries of Empire have ingrained in the British temperament. They laid aside all prejudices of blood and race, and treated the

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Malays as human beings who, given the chance, would gradually respond like any others to firmness, understanding and friendly interest. Their work was their life; to not a few it was also their death. They learned the language of the people and made their ways and beliefs and idiosyncrasies their first study. They lived among them alone, seeing no white faces except those of their subordinates, and putting all the recreations and pleasures of civilized life far from them. They were given a free hand and they flung themselves into the work of making Malaya as a business man might fling himself into the work of making money.

Men of this kind are not to be manufactured offhand; the traditions and the experience that alone make them possible are the long result of time. The secret of British success on assuming control of the Malay States is, for the most part, incommunicable, being largely a matter of individuals and of individual character and aptitudes. But in no form of activity is it enough merely to get the best men. They must also work along sound lines; policy and personality must go hand in hand. The British in the Malay States, as in all their Oriental possessions, were in no hurry to reform; and to the abstract principles of government they paid little heed. Instead, they began, very quietly and without fuss, to deal out an even-handed and inflexible justice. This is the greatest novelty that can be offered to an Oriental, but it is one he greatly appreciates. The peasantry soon came to realize that, thanks to the white men, they could no longer be plundered. Simultaneously the country was opened up by roads and railways and the dredging of rivers. Undreamed-of markets were thus made accessible for labor and produce. Arbitrary taxation, forced labor, compulsory levies were reorganized out of existence. Life and property were made secure. Slavery and piracy were put down. Schools and hospitals and banks began to spring up. Drainage and irrigation works were instituted. But, while everything that could be done to improve the material condition of the country was done and done well, the native potentates found their dignity carefully consulted at every turn. Even to-day the fiction that the English administrators are only there to "advise" is still rigorously maintained, and all orders, proclamations and laws are still issued in the Sultan's name. The native rulers were con-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

firmed in their positions; the usual ceremonies of respect were paid to them; they were allowed a liberal income, and they were gradually educated into a new sense of their responsibilities. So far as is possible, all the lower grades of the civil service are now filled by Malays. In fact, the detailed work of administration is to-day almost entirely performed by them; and even on the Bench there are not a few native judges who have learned from the British how to deal fairly between man and man. But all this development has been a gradual process. There was no cataclysmal stroke of reform. From time to time the better way was pointed out and the Malays were urged gently along it. Civilization advanced evenly and almost imperceptibly, and the ground was patiently prepared beforehand. In one vital sphere of Malay life there has been no interference. The British pledged themselves when they entered the country to leave untouched the Mohammedan religion and all its rites and observances; and native habits, manners and customs were changed, when they were changed at all, only with infinite caution.

There are features in this admirable record that are common to all British achievements in ruling Orientals. The first stage is pretty nearly always the same. A few British administrators, left largely to their own devices, are placed in charge, whether as actual governors or as "advisers" and "Residents," of States like the Malay States or Burmah or Egypt or Ceylon. Their rule for a long while is personal and autocratic; they get to know the people; they win their reluctant trust; they are not interfered with either by the Home Government or by their superiors on the spot; they are not in the least concerned with political theories; they look conditions squarely in the face and consider how they may be bettered; little is asked from them in the way of reports and statistics; their word is law throughout their districts; they govern in the old patriarchal fashion. It is under such conditions that the British faculty for rulership shows itself at its best. But, in the nature of things, such conditions cannot be permanent. They characterize merely the early tentative stages of administration; the progress that is hammered out of them ushers in a new order; the haphazard, personal rule gives way to organized government by system. That is the second of the two phases to which I alluded at the outset. It is a necessary, an inevitable phase. It is, indeed, at once the price and

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

the proof of success. But, at the same time, it brings with it perils and problems of its own. When the governing man is transformed, as sooner or later he must be, into a mere cog in the governing machine, a definite and momentous turning-point has been reached.

I have said that this transformation is unavoidable. It is unavoidable, in the first place, because a government that is once set on its feet quickly develops activities beyond the control of any one man. The mere multiplication of official interests and enterprises makes centralization and bureaucracy essential. Telephones, telegraphs and railways play havoc with the freedom and isolation that were the basis of autocratic rulership. Headquarters nowadays are in almost hourly touch with every officer in the service. He is no longer a beneficent and largely untrammelled despot, trusting his own judgment and acting upon his own responsibility, but a clerk at the end of a wire, whose orders may be countermanded, whose decisions may be reversed and most of whose time is devoted to providing an insatiable bureaucracy with reports, statistics and computations of everything that is computable. Thus the administrator is gradually withdrawn from his old, confidential relations with the people under him, becomes a harassed slave of the pen and parts with much of his personal authority and prestige; and this, in an Oriental country, where the mainspring of all loyalty is devotion to a single head, and where nothing has ever been known or desired but some form or other of one-man rule, is a profound and irreparable loss. But a yet more disintegrating influence is introduced by the spirit of British democracy, and by the application to Eastern peoples of principles that are only suited to certain phases of Western civilization. It was a saying of Froude's that free peoples cannot govern subject-races. The dictum, perhaps, needs qualifying. I should rather put it this way: Free peoples, when governing subject-races, will govern them in accordance with the traditions, instincts and principles they are accustomed to and have evolved at home. In other words, the conscience of a democracy forbids it to be liberal at home and autocratic abroad. It is impelled to prefer governing badly, in obedience to its own genius, to governing well at the behest of maxims and methods that are alien to its spirit and practices. It has an inclination, which is one of sentiment or of instinct rather than of reflection,

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

towards treating all politics and peoples as so many problems in algebra, to be solved by fixed formulas. The formulas it brings to their solution are the principles, the institutions, the political conceptions to which it is used and on which it has thrived at home. Thus Americans are necessarily driven to rule the Philippines in accordance with Jeffersonian doctrines. Thus the French base their colonial policy on "the principles of 1789," and look at African and Asiatic affairs from a point of view suitable only for the problems of a French commune. All democracies yield to the compulsion of this inward, dominating call. They are as zealous missionaries, and as keenly bent upon forcing all with whom they come in contact to see things through their own spectacles, as were ever the old autocracies. No democracy will ever believe that its meat can be another people's poison, or that all nations would not prosper equally well on the regimen that has chanced to suit itself.

Great Britain has very largely acted upon this theory in her government of India, with the result that she has created a system that is half liberal and half despotic, at once too weak to be congenial to Oriental instincts and too autocratic to be altogether acceptable to Western Radicalism. She has foisted upon India freedom of the Press, the right of public meeting and debate, the jury system and representation on municipal councils, and she has done so not because these things were wanted in India, but because Englishmen were accustomed to them in England. In pursuing this policy—a policy, as I have said, prescribed by the very law of her being—Great Britain has not only enormously increased the difficulties of ruling India, but has imperilled the ultimate end and crown of all her endeavors. Her presence in Egypt, India, the Malay States and similar countries can only be justified by the degree in which she helps her wards to help themselves. The far-off but constant ideal to which the people of England look forward is that all these dependencies may one day take their place as self-governing units in a great Imperial confederation; and the tendencies of their policies are sound or otherwise just so far as they promote or hinder progress to that ideal. It would from this standpoint be well worth inquiring whether, and if so how far, the democratic innovations that have been foisted upon India and Egypt are of a kind to encourage a consciousness, if not of nationality, at least of some

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

underlying unity that may develop hereafter into the beginnings of an eventual autonomy. I think unquestionably it would be found that they are a hindrance and not a help to the growth of Indian or Egyptian nationality. The freedom of the press, for instance, has been used in India by Mohammedans to storm at Hindus and by Hindus to gird at Mohammedans, and by both to assail British rule. Representation on municipal councils, again, results in deepening all the cleavages of race, religion and language. That government exists to insure security is a sound enough maxim in an old and highly developed country like England. But it breaks down when applied to India. The true function of government in India should be, as it used to be in Europe, to unify men of many creeds, tongues and races into a more or less cohesive whole. Again, the monarch in England is little more than a constitutional figurehead. But in India the sovereign is, or should be, the active and supreme authority; and the failure of British statesmanship to bring the wishes and person of the sovereign prominently before his Indian subjects has resulted in an appalling wastage of that instinct of loyalty which is the cardinal virtue of the East. There is nothing to appeal to their imaginations; no central point or figure on which their affections may focus; the impulse which could alone supply the three hundred millions of people in India with a common emotional bond is wholly starved by their rulers. Once more, it is an excellent provision in a land like Great Britain that the permanent servants of the State should be forbidden to take part in politics. But the same regulation when extended to India means that Government is attacked from all sides and defended on none, and that the gravest delusions and misapprehensions spread among the people because there is no agency to expose or correct them.

Thus the introduction of democratic ideas is really rotting away the only foundations on which an autonomous India might conceivably be built. At the same time, it widens the gulf between rulers and ruled. The British Raj has at no time seemed in native eyes to rest more obviously on the sword's point; and among those who are engaged in the daily work of Indian administration there is an increasing consciousness that their isolation as a ruling race grows every year more complete. The more the British Anglicize India, the more alien they become

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

to her. For the decisive personal autocracy of the past, they have substituted government by system; and those who work the system are more and more separated from the people by intervening clouds of native officials. They are tied, moreover, to the telegraph at Simla or Calcutta; they are more than ever immersed in despatch-writing and the mere administrative routine; and with Europe brought next door to them by steamer and cable, they look upon India less as a home than as a temporary workshop. All this does not, indeed, prevent them from going through the day's task with admirable zeal, resource and kindliness; but it does prevent them from acquiring, or from caring to acquire, a real knowledge of the native mind, and from forming those semi-paternal relations with the people of their districts that were the saving clause of the old regime. And, while the sphere of British influence contracts, that of native opinion expands. By teaching them English the British have taught them to understand not themselves, but one another, and have thus provided them with an aid to solidarity and therefore to agitation. The railways, again, have made intercourse both possible and popular; the native press stimulates an incessant intellectual ferment; far more natives receive a university education than their rulers can find employment for, and discontent is thereby fostered; the spread of industrialism quickens with a new impulse of mind and spirit all whom it reaches; and of late, the rise of Japan has undoubtedly stirred the Oriental consciousness with a vision of unimagined possibilities. These are largely conditions of Great Britain's own making, and having made them she cannot expect them to end in nullity. Neither can she retract the dubious gifts she has bestowed. Public opinion in England would not allow the Indian press to be abolished or the right of public meeting to be rescinded or representation on local councils to be done away with, or the Sovereign to assume even the appearance of an Asiatic autocrat. Only a great convulsion—and it may come to that—will effect a revolution in the principles of British government in India.

Great Britain has admittedly brought the mechanics of Empire-making and Empire-ruling to a pitch of unrivalled perfection. She has devised a system admirably designed and dispassionately applied. But with a certain psychological obtuseness she overrates the effects of her system and its material results

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

upon the native mind. Her record, with all its mistakes, is a brilliant one and she is rightly proud of it, but to expect from it a harvest of loyalty and contentment among Indians and Egyptians is to betray the characteristically British lack of dramatic sympathy. Wherever Great Britain goes she imposes peace and order, she establishes the reign of justice, she promotes the material prosperity of the peoples under her rule, she educates them, fences with innumerable securities their persons and property, and preserves to them, with as little interference as possible, their social and religious customs. And for these benefits she looks for their eternal gratitude, if not for their eternal affection. No error of sentimentalism could well be greater. The British have yet to realize that their very success increases their difficulties and that good government, the longer it is maintained, becomes more and more an established and normal condition and less and less a special ground for gratitude. Among a generation that has known nothing else justice is no novelty, security is taken for granted, while prosperity and education create more aspirations than they satisfy. It is as true to-day as ever that when men wax fat they kick against the pricks. Meek acceptance of British rule gives way to criticism; criticism passes into abuse; abuse is developed into a demand for a larger and ever larger share in directing the administration that the British have erected. There was a pregnant sentence in Lord Cromer's final report in which he practically took upon himself the growth of the Egyptian Nationalist idea. "It has been evoked," he wrote, "by the benefits which, with a rapidity probably unparalleled in history, have been conferred upon the country by the introduction of Western civilization at the hands of an alien race; and it is surely the irony of political destiny that that race, or the instruments through whom it has principally acted, should be represented as the principal obstacles to the realization of schemes the conception of which is mainly due to their own action." Those who will ponder these words and their implications will come very near the heart of the master-problem of British Imperialism. Stated in its broadest terms, that problem is the infinitely arduous and delicate one of escaping the penalties of too much democracy and of too much good government. The British are beginning to realize that the very excellence of their rule provides the means for its over-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

throw and that its material success implies that they are creating the conditions most favorable to its resistance. It is impossible for Great Britain to advance the peoples under her tutelage without at the same time instilling into them a spirit of independence and an ambition to supplant her, or at least to stand on a parity with her, in the ordering of their affairs.

Great Britain in the past has magnificently created. There now lies ahead of her the far more difficult task of assimilation. Her rule, everywhere a mechanical success, is nowhere popular; her administrators, everywhere trusted and honored, are nowhere loved. Mr. John Morley not long ago was declaring that in India bad manners are a political crime. He might have added that they are a crime that is daily committed. The British at the best are not an ingratiating people, but in India and in Egypt their aloofness, arrogance and their failure to establish that communion of sentiment with the natives which the French in all their possessions display a real genius for cultivating, have heaped up against them an amount of resentment that may one day burst forth in violence. In the anxious times that visibly confront British dominion in Oriental countries, the personal conduct and behavior of every British official, and indeed of every Englishman in those countries, will be a factor that will contribute something towards averting or precipitating the crisis; and it is, in my judgment, an omen of the most sinister significance that all observers on the spot agree in reporting the social tension between rulers and ruled as constantly on the increase. Then, again, it is clear that the new problems at which I have glanced—the problem of readjusting, if that still be possible, the principles of government to the instincts of the governed, and the problem of extending democratic "rights" without weakening the administrative machine or yielding to mere agitation or giving further openings to disaffection and unrest—are problems that demand the highest kind of statesmanship. It is questionable whether Great Britain is any longer in a position to furnish this kind of statesmanship. For one thing, the disease may have gone so far that nothing but the free use of the knife can stay its progress. A great many Indians have obviously simplified all their policies and aspirations into a resolve to make an end of British rule. They go upon the principle enunciated by the late British Premier, that good government is no substi-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

tute for self-government. How far their views are sympathized in by the masses there is at present no means of knowing; but that India has entered a period of turbulence and convulsive agitation seems certain. It would in any case and at any time be a matter of supreme difficulty to devise a policy for the new emergency, and to determine whether repression or further concessions or a mixture of both was the right course to pursue. But just now the British freedom of choice and of action is manacled to an unprecedented degree by the democratic upheaval in Great Britain itself. The healthy and judicious indifference hitherto displayed towards the domestic affairs of Egypt and India by the House of Commons is being replaced by an impolitic curiosity. More and more M.P.'s are growing perilously interested in Egypt and India, are beginning to ask for streams of fact, are prying into this and questioning that, and are doing what they can to convert the supremacy of the House of Commons from a necessary fiction into an inquisitorial fact. They bring to the problem of Oriental government great earnestness, a colossal altruism, little imagination, a profound faith in the democratic idea, and no local knowledge. That is an impossible equipment for Imperial statesmanship, and its increasing favor among British Radicals is a danger of the first magnitude. A nonentity at Westminster may be hailed as a prophet in Egypt and India; and the outpourings of uninformed, sentimental and truculent visionaries in the House of Commons may stir up a ferment it will need blood and iron to allay. The Imperial crisis, therefore, that looms ahead is many-sided. Great Britain has sown the wind of democracy; she may now have to face the whirlwind. The education she has encouraged, the liberty she has granted, the license she has tolerated, the prosperity she has established, furnish the weapons which are now being turned against her. She cannot retreat; she hardly dare advance. The future appears to demand from her the exercise of precisely those qualities of sympathy, fellowship and psychological insight that are most wanting in the national temperament; and her Parliament, palpitating with an ill-regulated humanitarianism, is an assembly better fitted to paralyze than to fortify the arm of statesmanship.

BRITANNICUS.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

THE FOUNDATIONS OF PROSPERITY.

BY GIFFORD PINCHOT.

No other people on earth, I suppose, ever entered into possession of such material equipment as the people of the United States found when they first came to this continent. No other people have ever used their equipment with such vigor and determination, and have obtained such results, as have marked the exploitation by the people of the United States of the resources which they found. In wealth and in variety together these resources have a value apparently far beyond those of any other similar area which has been settled or can be settled on the earth by the white race.

In developing these resources we have developed also certain national characteristics. No other people have ever laid their hands to the immediate, practical task, and made use of their natural resources with the same effectiveness as have our own. It has been a story of magnificent achievement, a story unparalleled, and to remain unparalleled. The results have been both material and moral. In grappling with their economic problems the Americans have developed a type of efficiency which is a new thing in the world. With our marvellously rapid increase in wealth has been developed also a capacity for doing. The capacity to do has been fed by the doing, and we are now characterized by a combination of developed wealth and developed character unequalled among national assets. It has been an achievement worthy of high praise; an achievement of which every one of us has the right to be proud. On that side there is little to repine over.

But that, unfortunately, is not the whole of the story. There is a homely old anecdote of a farmer who had met with a very serious misfortune and was telling a neighbor about it. Sitting

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

in his chair the night before, he had heard an owl hooting outside, and went out to shoot it. The owl was on the ridge-pole of his barn. When he fired at the owl, the lighted wad dropped through an open window into the barn, and set fire to the hay. The flames spread from the barn to the woodshed, and then to the house, and with great difficulty he and his wife saved a small part of their possessions. The neighbor listened to all this recital with growing impatience. At last he broke in, "But did you kill the owl?" We have got our owl, and our owl is a splendid bird. But, meanwhile, our woodshed and our coal-bin and our spring house and our hay-mow, and a whole lot of the other indispensable things with which we must carry on our business, have either been burned up or very seriously scorched. The owl we have shot has cost us a heavy price.

What is the actual situation? What has it cost us to make this wonderful development? One very great and serious cost is the creation of an absolutely false point of view. We have come to think that the things worth while, and the only things worth while, are the things immediately at hand, and that foresight and consideration of the welfare of those who are coming after us are negligible factors. This is the point of view of the nation as illustrated in what it does. The future is left out of account in the race for immediate results, for the immediate dollar. That is the fundamental harm that has been done.

Before the difficulty can be corrected, we must not only take certain specific measures to preserve our natural resources, but, far more important, we must change our point of view. We have got to understand that, with a nation as with a man, foresight and prudence are the very foundations of successful continuance. It is a thought worth pondering that the qualities which go to make up a good citizen—the foresight which gives practical success, the present sacrifice for the sake of the future of the individual and his family, the desire that his children may have a fair chance to succeed after he has passed on—have found almost no organized expression in our national life. There is one exception—and it is a notable exception, even though it, too, needs making over in the interest of greater national efficiency—the exception of our public-school system. I believe that the Forest Service is the sole present example of a branch of our National Government which finds the reason for its existence

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

in the need of the long look ahead—in the need of making present provision for the generations that are to follow. As a nation, we have shown a shortsightedness of which, as individuals, no one of us would be guilty.

The essential thing to be achieved, if our natural resources are to be preserved, is far less the taking of specific and individual measures than the creation of a mental attitude on the part of our people, the creation of an habitual and effective public sentiment which will look ahead. For years before anything actually began to be done in forestry in this country, intelligent men would say, when asked, that forestry was an important question, and something ought to be done about it. But that was not enough to bring anything to pass. If we ask the first man we meet on the street, "Is it a good thing to conserve natural resources?" the answer will be, "Of course." But, until we have a sufficiently vital and militant public sentiment behind that general, vague opinion, until we get a changed point of view with life enough in it to demand action on the part of the men whom the people send to Congress and to the State legislatures, nothing will be done.

The careless attitude of most of our people has expressed itself in many directions. When we came first into this country, it was filled with game, and we used it absolutely without thought of to-morrow. The buffalo is our great and striking illustration of wicked, stupid waste. That great game animal has been so reduced in numbers that, out of the millions which once lived in this country, there are now only a thousand within the borders of the nation. The wild pigeons furnish another striking example. Other similar exterminations took place of game here, fish there, until the greatness of what had been accomplished in the way of destruction challenged attention. When settlements first began to attain some size along the Connecticut River, the apprentices in the various trades were required by their articles of indenture to agree to eat salmon so many times a week, and the masters were bound not to give them salmon more than so many times a week. But the Connecticut River salmon disappeared long ago, and it seems as if the Columbia River salmon might ultimately follow suit.

Effective work for the future first began to be done in the case of game and fish. The period of destruction in that matter

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

has been followed by a period of upbuilding, and it is safe to say that, as to game and fish and birds, we have passed the period of greatest danger. It was not a bad thing, in one sense, that the buffalo should have been partly destroyed, because the economic development of the western country could never have taken place if the grasses upon which the buffalo lived had not been made available for domestic cattle. The point is that we cared nothing about what we ought to have done. We simply do the easy, stupid thing, without foresight, and the results are very bad in very many cases.

There are certain renewable resources, and certain resources which are not renewable. Minerals are non-renewable resources. What may happen in the course of centuries hereafter does not interest us at all. We know that when the coal is gone, so far as we are concerned it is gone for good. Exhaustion of our supply of anthracite has been predicted in about fifty years. Yet in certain kinds of coal-mining, and perhaps even on the average, only about half the coal in the ground has actually been mined before the roof was allowed to fall in, so that what remains is lost forever. In other words, our coal-mining wastes (if this is true) one-half our coal, which is absolutely indispensable for our present industrial life. What may happen in the future it is difficult to predict, but we know that at present coal is a necessity, and we know that the supply of it is limited. Yet we are acting as if it made no difference whatever how much of that supply is lost to us. More than that, of the fifty per cent. which is mined, only about ten per cent., and in many cases only five per cent., of the energy of the coal is actually transformed into work. In short, under our present methods an excessively small quantity of the value of the coal to all our people is even put to use.

This is a very serious indictment of our national intelligence, with all due allowance for the necessities of the case. The individual who should follow such a course with the first necessities of his existence would speedily earn a very unenviable reputation among his fellows. Suppose a man adrift at sea in an open boat with a little water, enough to last him with ordinary use for five days, an infinitesimal chance of being picked up, and the certainty that he could not make land in less than twenty days. What would any of us say of him if, under these circumstances,

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

he not only drank all the water he wanted, but used the rest of it to wash his hands with and then threw it over the side? Yet we are not only using all the coal we want, but we are throwing a lot of it away.

Natural gas we have handled in precisely the same manner. The great flambeaux were kept burning day and night, year in and year out, in certain gas fields, until what people had called an "inexhaustible supply," until they really came to believe it, was all gone. So also many oil fields of the United States are already exhausted; and, with the utmost hopefulness in forecasting the discovery of new fields, is it not fairly reasonable to suppose that in time the oil, too, will have gone the way of much of the gas? Perhaps in nothing else, except our forests, have we as a people so distinctly emphasized our lack of foresight as we have in our treatment of mineral fuels, which in our present state of industry we must have to go on with our work. The facts seem to me incontrovertible and the conclusion inevitable. We ought to have known better, and now the time is actually here when, instead of the limitations which are imposed upon us by commercial conditions, we ought ourselves as a nation to grasp this question definitely and foresightedly as one of our great problems, one of the most difficult and one of the most essential which we must meet.

The subject of conservation as a national policy is interwoven with another important question of national policy—that of our public-land laws. From Tennessee and Georgia to the Gulf, and from Ohio to the Pacific Ocean, virtually all the land which has passed into private ownership has, except in the State of Texas, been acquired from the National Government. The laws under which most of this land was disposed of, and is still being disposed of, were made years ago. Two fundamental ideas underlie them. One is that it is a good thing virtually to give away our natural resources in order to get them into private ownership. The other is that these resources, enormously valuable in the mass, should be given in comparatively small quantities to a great many individuals, so as to diffuse prosperity and promote the settlement of the country by independent freeholders.

It is, I think, beyond question that, in its underlying principle and intent, the Homestead Law is thoroughly sound and wise. This law laid the basis of our present public-land policy, and be-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

came, with the mineral-land law, the pattern after which most of our other land laws have been modelled. It was right that Uncle Sam should give, out of his vast unpeopled domain of agricultural land, a farm to any man who wanted it and was willing to live upon and work it for himself and his family. But it was not right that he should allow great quantities of the public domain to pass into the hands of men who wanted the land, not to work it, but to speculate with it and take the unearned increment which time brings to investments of this kind. It was not right that great and very valuable areas of timber lands, coal lands, and other classes of land, ownership of which meant control of natural resources, both renewable and unrenewable, of vital importance to the permanent public welfare, should be given away for enrichment of a comparatively few individuals through wasteful use. The laws were not meant to work that way. That they did in actual practice work that way on a very large scale was primarily because they provided no legitimate method by which lands other than mineral lands and farm lands could be made any use of at all.

Take the coal lands, for example. The law limits to a total of 640 acres the amount of coal lands which any one association of persons may obtain from the Government. Corporations intending to engage in coal-mining usually must control far larger areas than this before undertaking the expenditures required to develop their mines. The price at which the Government has disposed of these lands has been far below their actual value. By inducing individuals who were secretly their agents to take up coal lands for them, coal-mining corporations have been able to obtain what they wanted under the law, though in violation of its spirit. The law itself was wrong, because, in the first place, it made it excessively difficult for a man honestly to work the lands, and in the second place it omitted all consideration for the future. If Uncle Sam had said to our citizens, "You may have a coal-mine under practicable and definite rules, but you must work that coal-mine so that after you have obtained all you can from it, the people will have suffered just as little loss of wealth as possible," that would have been a good thing; but Uncle Sam said, "You may take the coal-mine, under very unworkable conditions, and after you have it you may do what you like with it." So we come to the necessity for the protection of the mineral

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

fuels remaining on the public lands on the one side, and on the other to the necessity for preventing the passage of large areas of public land into the hands of large holders for the sake of speculation.

The Homestead Law has often been made the means by which land has been taken possession of fraudulently by single owners, sometimes in ways which are not without their picturesque and humorous details. The law, for example, provides that when a homesteader takes up a piece of land he must build a house on it, and in his affidavit he must describe that house and bring the affidavit of two of his neighbors to prove that what he says is true. Sometimes the house was described as having been 14 by 16 or 18 by 20, the affiant having omitted to state that he referred to inches and not to feet, and that his house was built out of a cracker-box. There was an impression in the West for many years that a man needed to sleep on his homestead only once in six months. Where a large owner of land got his cowboys and sheep-herders to take up lands for him, he has been known to build a little house on wheels large enough for a man to sleep in, and move it from place to place. At the first stop of that little house, the first alleged settler would pass a night on his "homestead." The next night it would go to the next quarter section and the next man would sleep in it. By this ingenious arrangement it was not necessary for any one to build a house, and the land passed first into the hands of the men who did the sleeping, and then into the hands of the man who built the house on wheels. Many States have had large areas of swamp lands given to them and have sold them again. To establish the swampy character of such lands, would-be purchasers have made affidavit that they had passed over these alleged swamp lands in a boat, and have omitted to state that the boat, like the house, was on wheels.

Now, in these ways the conservation of the land for the man who himself will use it has been set at naught. There is nothing more important for us politically than the distinction between tenants and freeholders. Our land laws were distinctly intended to create freeholders. But vast areas of the land have gone into the hands of a few people whose tenants now cultivate it; and because they are tenants on the land these cultivators are less valuable citizens than they would be if they owned their own homes.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Every man ought to own his own home. Some years ago I went into a certain valley in the West. It was not long after President Cleveland made twenty million acres of forest reservations at one time, and set all the West on fire. I was travelling both to acquaint myself with public sentiment and to visit these different forests and see what ought to be done with them, and it was my habit to ask questions wherever I went. As a rule, the Westerner knows what he thinks, and is not ashamed of it, and he will tell exactly what he believes and wants if he is given half a chance. The moment I got into this valley, there came an absolute change in the attitude of the people. I was able with a great deal of trouble to find out what A, B and C thought, if I was willing to assure them it should go no farther. The trouble was that the people who lived in that valley did not know what the man who owned it thought, and they did not wish to tell me what they thought until they found out.

Since that day the impression has grown upon me profoundly that scarcely anything is more important to this country than guarding the land for the homemaker as against the large landholder. The latter, through control of the land, must have more or less control of the tenant who holds subject to his will. As the President has pointed out over and over again, the object of the whole public-land system is the making and maintenance of prosperous homes. It is difficult, until one comes into practical contact with it, to realize the vital and tremendous importance of this question of tenant *versus* freeholder.

Soil erosion raises another important problem of conservation. It has been truly said that the greatest tax a farmer has to pay is the tax levied on his land by the rain. The water both leaches out of the soil the elements which give it fertility and washes away the soil itself. And a singular beauty of our methods of cultivation which allow this is brought out by the fact that, after the farmer has lost this soil from the field where it belongs, it goes down into the channels of the rivers, where it does not belong, and costs the nation millions of dollars to take it out. If there ever was a loss that cut both ways, it is this loss of soil from the farm.

When the place of the buffalo was taken by domestic cattle, there was grazing enough at first for everybody, and the cattle business flourished. In consequence, much of the range became badly overstocked. Then came at intervals dry years, and the ranges were

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

relieved by the death in some cases of more than eighty per cent. of the cattle. This great loss led to a change in the methods of handling range stock; but the essential condition which had led to the trouble remained unchanged, and is unchanged to the present day. That condition is the unrestricted competition of individuals, each of whom wants to get all he can, and none of whom has any legal right to the exclusive use of the range or interest in its protection. From this condition the range suffers worse than the stock. Since any man who wants to use an open Western range has just as much right as any other man to use it, it often becomes a case of racing for the best, especially in the sheep industry. In the opinion of men who know, the carrying power of the Western ranges—some three hundred or four hundred million acres—has been reduced to not more than half what it once was. That this vast area of land should be able to contribute to the wealth of our people only one-half of what it once could is, surely, a reproach to our national intelligence.

If any man handles his property so as to damage his neighbor, he can be stopped. But if any man chooses to use his property in such a way as to destroy a part of the sum total of the wealth of the whole country, and therefore do harm to all the people, and to their descendants, that is supposed to be nobody's business. Change in the method of handling the public range is being fought on the ground that it is all a private matter, which the stockmen should be allowed to adjust among themselves. That the nation as a whole suffers is, I maintain with a good deal of vigor, somebody's business—the business of all of us. The condition of the range in Wyoming influences the prices of mutton in New York. Therefore, all of us have a share in this question of range control. We have a right to demand that a method which gives fair dealing both to the individual and to all the people together shall be put into operation. Individualism has been the key-note of our great development, and individualism is the method of doing business which makes character; but individualism which substantially says to all of us that it has the right to acquire one dollar for itself at the cost of two dollars to the commonwealth is individualism pushed too far. It is this point of view which very largely underlies the question of conservation. We shall come after a while to the point of view in legislation, that the general good ought specifically and definitely to outweigh private good.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

In some cases, the big and powerful stockman has been able to monopolize large areas of the open range for his own exclusive use. One way in which this has been brought about is through monopoly of the water. By making himself owner of a relatively small amount of land, one man may become virtually owner of fifty or a hundred square miles of the open range. For example, a stockman in Montana or Idaho is using a range watered by a stream which runs through it. Under the public-land laws, land acquired by settlers has to be taken in rectangular subdivisions of a square mile, and the smallest subdivision which can be entered is forty acres. There is in existence what is known as land scrip. This represents the right acquired in various ways to take possession of public lands without settlement. It can be bought and sold. By buying land scrip in forty-acre tracts and making what are called shoe-string locations contiguous to each other all along a stream, until he had plastered it with scrip for miles, the stockman can become practically the owner of the stream, the controller of all the land which it waters. In such ways as this the man of large means has not seldom monopolized what is still nominally open to all. This may tend to the conservation of the range, but if so, it is at the expense of the principle of the square deal.

Any well-considered plan for conservation of the range, prepared with a view to making this resource contribute most fully to the general welfare, will have as one of its advantages that it will help to prevent the powerful man, the man of large means, from taking undue advantage of the man of small means. As things are now the big man always holds trumps. Perhaps it is the case of a man with five, ten or twenty bands of sheep. A small man with one band comes into the region which the other wishes to monopolize. Sheep are grazed in the West in "bands" of from 1,800 to 2,700 or 3,000 head, each cared for by a single "herder." The big man has so many bands of sheep that he can run his sheep around the band of the small man, and whether the small owner moves north, south, east or west, he will find the grass on the range eaten up. Or the big man will set aside a band to mix with the small man, after which it takes days to separate them. When that separation is finished, the sheep are mixed again. So, although the public-land laws were specifically intended to help the small man, the condition has been brought about all

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

over the West that the big man has the advantage and the small man usually draws the short straw.

If we are to have freeholders on the land, we must have small men as freeholders; and the small man must have an equal chance.

If we have been shortsighted in our use of mineral fuel and the open range, we have been vastly more shortsighted in our use of the forests. Wood is not less necessary to our present civilization than coal. The best figures obtainable indicate that at our present rate of consumption we have now on hand standing timber for only about twenty years. And like the man floating in the open boat, we have no other supply from which we can expect to meet our demands. The Canadians are coming to need all the wood they have; so with the Mexicans. South America is wonderfully rich in forests, but the wood is mainly of kinds unsuited to our principal needs. Siberia has much timber, but it would involve very heavy expense to transport it by rail to the ocean. We have permitted ourselves to get into a condition where a timber famine is not only likely, but certain. The best we can expect to do is somewhat to mitigate the famine; but how much we can mitigate it no one can yet tell. How much the use of re-enforced concrete, steel and other materials will help cannot be said. That these will help largely there can be no doubt. Yet the curious fact remains that though we have already so largely substituted brick and stone and steel and concrete for wood in building, vastly more wood is used for construction purposes in the United States to-day than when wood was the only material used. At best, we have gotten ourselves into a place where we must suffer, and we must pay the bill.

Fortunately, it is not altogether too late to take some remedial measures. The nation has already about 165,000,000 acres of national forests in the West, and is likely to have others in the East. In time these forests will be brought to the point where they will produce the most timber which the land is capable of growing. But the Government cannot be expected to meet, from less than one-fourth of the forests of the United States, a demand three times greater than the annual growth of all the forests of the United States. What is needed is to bring the forests which are in private hands under right use.

When the forests fail, every kind of industry, every kind of business, every man, woman and child in the country will feel

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

the pinch. Forest products enter into every part of our domestic and social economy. This is true because the forests furnish not only wood and pasture, but also water. As our forests are destroyed our water powers suffer, the navigability of our streams suffers, irrigation suffers, and the domestic and manufacturing water-supply suffers. Wherever flow streams which rise in the mountains or in the forests, as do practically all the streams of the country, there forest preservation is a subject of first importance. The central cause for the creation of the Waterways Commission by President Roosevelt last year was the need that we should group together all possible uses of our streams, and get from them, in all these uses combined, the largest service which they can render; just as the ordinary man of common sense uses his farm, his store, his horse and wagon to serve his convenience and welfare, not in one way, but in as many ways as circumstances will permit. In the past it has made little difference whether, in the development of navigation, the possibility of the use of a stream for water power was destroyed or not; whether, in the development of irrigation, the possibility of navigation was overlooked or not. But the time has come when we should use prudence and foresight in dealing with the streams with all their possible uses in plain view.

The principle which underlies the whole conservation movement seems so simple and axiomatic that it is difficult to argue it. It ought not to be necessary to point out that, when you cannot get any more of some necessity of daily life, you ought to save in the best way you can what you have of it. President Roosevelt said in a recent message that our streams are less navigable now than fifty years ago, and on the whole less navigated. While we have been spending millions and millions on them in their lower reaches, we have shut our eyes to the fact that the navigability of a stream depends first of all on what happens at the headwaters, and that the net result of the expenditure of these millions has been to leave the streams in worse condition than they were in when the expenditure began. We have been equally shortsighted, as I think, in allowing great monopolies to be formed for the use of water power from these streams without the possibility of control in the public interest, or of return to the public for the immensely valuable privileges acquired from the public. During the last session of Congress companies interested in the development of electric power in the West sought gen-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

eral legislation from Congress which would give to private concerns a virtual monopoly of water power throughout the public lands of the United States, while special bills have been introduced which would grant in the aggregate to private companies the enormous total of 1,300,000 horse-power, largely in the older States. The capital value of 1,300,000 horse-power, when developed, would run into the hundreds of millions.

The interest of the people at large is greater than the interest of any single man or of any single body of men less than all the people. When Uncle Sam provides for the use of his natural resources, it is no more than fair that he who receives the right to use them should be required to do so in such a way as to do as much good, and as little harm, as possible.

I believe that this is the most fundamental question now before this country. If we succeed in the conservation of our natural resources, we shall have an opportunity to succeed in everything else; if we fail in the conservation of our natural resources, we shall be certain to fail in everything else. To have a successful and prosperous and happy people governing themselves by wise laws, there must be land for them to live on and natural resources for their support. If we fail in this, all the rest goes. If we win in this, none of us is prepared to believe that we shall not win in all else besides.

GIFFORD PINCHOT.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

THE MEDICAL FEE.

BY ARTHUR C. HEFFENGER, M.D.

THE publicity given to the occasional large fees which have been received by physicians and surgeons during recent years in America has aroused acute public interest, and brought forth from time to time ill-judged criticism. It is the object of this paper to show that the medical profession really gets no more than it conscientiously earns, and that the laity pays no more than its just obligation.

Large fees are few and far between, and are paid by the wealthy, often as gratuities. It is a fact that these same fees are no larger to-day than those paid in England, and sometimes in Russia, a century ago.

Who shall say what a man may do in gratitude for a life saved? The value of the service rendered, if measured in dollars, would depend upon the commercial value of the life, or its value in other respects to the community or country or even the world.

The American Medical Association, our highest medical authority, has never attempted to establish an ethical fee. In point of fact, the fee evolves itself, and ever has been and ever will be a graded one. The great bulk of practice is practically charity—that is, it represents small fees or no fees. This is true alike in the remote country districts, and in the great metropolitan centres. There is one difference, however, which should be distinctly remembered, and that is that rural charity is generally deserved, whereas urban charity is often misplaced. It is stated that practically thirty-three per cent. of the entire practice of New York City is charity, and that in a third of such cases the doctor is imposed upon.

In view of these facts, and considering that few physicians die rich, can it be said that the doctor is overpaid?

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

The fee of the general practitioner is inevitably determined by the financial standing of the community in which he practises, and the law of nature and economics will, as a rule, put the right man in the right place. It naturally follows that the best equipped men gravitate to the centres which appreciate and demand high standards, and expect to pay commensurately for them. Among these able-to-pay people, however, there is an occasional protest, and insinuation that the doctor is commercial and mercenary, exacting fees beyond the value of his professional service. A pertinent case of this kind is cited by Dr. John L. Hildreth of Massachusetts, in the Annual Discourse before the Massachusetts Medical Society in June, 1906, as follows: "A New York surgeon asked $1,000 for an operation for removing an appendix. The mother of the patient offered $600; but the surgeon protested, cited testimony of brother physicians to prove that the fee was not excessive, and finally received the balance. The letter which enclosed the last check was as follows: 'My discussion with you has been a friendly one, and so you will not, I am sure, suspect me of acrimony when I say that my feeling about the present excessive charge of surgeons is a general one, and the reflection of a sentiment that is everywhere one of surprise and dissatisfaction. We do not question your ability, but we feel you make us pay too dear for it.'"

This lady wrote under sincere conviction that she had been grossly overcharged, and she gave the impression that the surgeon used his professional skill as a mercenary lever to extort unearned dollars from his patient's purse. She did not plead financial inability to pay the bill, which was simply at the rate current in her locality and sphere; and she seemed oblivious to the fact that the surgeon who operated had unquestionably performed many difficult operations upon charitable subjects, aggregating thousands of dollars in value, to render himself proficient, gain prominence in his profession, and thus prove his qualifications to meet the demands of just such people. The surgeon is not the kind of man this complaint would make the world believe him. He is the hardest-worked and most unselfish of men; ever ready to do charity, night and day, and bestowing the same devoted skill and attention upon the suffering poor as upon the rich. A quotation from "The Making of a Man" well illustrates this: "The great French surgeon, M. Bourdon, was sent for one

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

day to perform a critical operation upon Cardinal Du Bois, the Prime Minister under the old Monarchy. 'You must not expect, sir,' remarked the Cardinal upon the surgeon's entrance, 'to treat me in the same rough manner in which you treat the poor miserable wretches at your hospital of the Hôtel Dieu.' 'My lord,' replied Bourdon, proudly, 'every one of those miserable wretches, as Your Eminence is pleased to call them, is a Prime Minister in my eyes.'"

The possession of great wealth undoubtedly carries with it heavy obligations, and every man should expect to pay according to his ability. The legal fee is graded according to the sum involved, or the value of the liberty or life jeopardized. Why should not the same principle obtain in medicine?

One of our foremost American surgeons has said:

"The fixing of a fee correctly is a talent which is either born in a man, or only learned after long experience. The doctor should endeavor to ascertain the patient's circumstances. He can thus be in a position, knowing as he does the gravity of the operation or its triviality, to say what the operation is worth to the patient. The doctor is necessarily the better judge of the two, as he can tell fairly well the value of both these factors, while the patient cannot be well trusted to estimate the severity of an operation about which he is, and must remain, more or less ignorant. When we see what the prices are in other callings, such as law and business, I think we can safely conclude that the profession as a whole is not overpaid. I think there are in every city men who take a purely commercial view of their work, who make work, and do other unprofessional acts, but they get found out sooner or later, and get their pay in kind."

There is practically little difference in the size of the fees asked by the same class of men in England and America. The usual chamber consultation fee in London is two guineas, and capital operations cost from twenty guineas to the thousands, according to the gravity of the case and the circumstances of the patient. Consultation on the Riviera, which necessitates several days of absence, is usually four hundred guineas.

Office consultation in our large cities ranges from five to twenty dollars. Consultations out of the cities involving an absence of half a day range from one hundred to two hundred dollars, while an absence of a day or two would justify a charge of five hundred or a thousand dollars.

A wealthy railroad magnate, having lost one daughter in child-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

birth, when his second was approaching accouchement, engaged an obstetrical specialist to remain with her for a period before the event, and until it was successfully over. He was to receive a hundred dollars a day while waiting, and a thousand for the accouchement. He waited patiently two months, and at the conclusion of the case received a fee of seven thousand dollars. The father of the lady was most anxious that nothing ill should befall his daughter, and determined to have the services of as good a man as could be obtained for as long a time as necessary. He got what he wanted, and the fee paid was certainly not excessive under the circumstances.

The care of a polo-player's fractured finger netted a New York surgeon one thousand dollars; while the removal of an appendix located on the left side by a surgeon of the same city, brought the tidy sum of fifteen thousand dollars. Neither bill was excessive under the circumstances. The polo-player was very wealthy; he desired a good finger and sought the services of an exceptionally well qualified man to care for it. The appendix case was a very unusual one; exceptional skill was required to find the aberrant organ, and the brilliant success of the operation made it worth the money to the patient, who was amply able to pay for it.

The twenty-five-thousand-dollar bill rendered to the estate of a late millionaire for a week's devoted professional services by a physician who travelled hundreds of miles and left a most lucrative practice to give them, was not excessive. Had the patient lived, he would undoubtedly have sent his check to this devoted friend and physician for an equal amount. Such gratuities are not infrequent. A Boston surgeon, a few years ago, performed laparotomy on the wife of a wealthy man, and, before he could send a bill, a check for ten thousand dollars was received.

The largest fee of this nature that has come within my knowledge was received by a family physician of New York, who attended a patient in a yacht from New York to a port in one of our Southern States, a voyage of about a week's duration. The patient, who was in the last stages of tuberculosis, died as they arrived in port. For his tender care and kindly ministrations, the doctor received a check for sixty thousand dollars.

There are a few men in every profession who sully the ranks to which they belong by resorting to methods that are unworthy

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

and ignoble; but such men are held in obloquy by their confrères, and are soon estimated at their true value by the community. These men are truly commercial and devoid of either professional or personal honor. They magnify trivial ailments, or convince patients that they have ills which do not exist, in order that they may get credit for performing remarkable cures, charge large fees, and gain unmerited reputation. This is pure quackery, though done under the cloak of regular practice, and the culprits are not confined to the lesser lights of the profession, but may be found among the most fashionable practitioners in metropolitan centres. They are often specialists, and, to get patients, are willing to resort to collusion with general practitioners, who, envious of the large fees they think the specialist gets, openly demand, before referring a patient, a division of the consulting or operating fee. Language is not strong enough to condemn such nefarious methods, and, happily, incidents of the kind are rare.

The general practitioner is the nearest man to the people, and his relations to the family are as intimate, and faith in him so implicit, it naturally occurs that he is asked to select the consultant when needed; and, as a rule, he may be relied upon to serve his patient's interest faithfully. Certainly he is a much safer guide than the lay friend who always knows just the man to go to.

Dr. Robert T. Morris, of New York, would settle the division of the fee on moral grounds. He says:

> "If it is worth ten thousand dollars to a man to have his gall stones removed, there is no doubt that the physician who carries the patient through convalescence to final recovery, the anæsthetist who gives the luxury and safety of modern anæsthesia, the assistants who are chosen because of special fitness for the work, should all share in receiving dignified compensation for their services. There is only one little point to be observed, and that is that the whole transaction must be made with the knowledge of the patient. Otherwise, we are guilty of collusion. The physician is a friend to the patient, and does not look upon the latter as his prey. Even among lawyers I find the same spirit prevailing, Horace Greeley to the contrary notwithstanding."

The large fees received by famous medical men in later life will be generally found to follow many years of ill-requited toil. The lives of Professor Samuel D. Gross, of America, and Sir Astley Cooper and Sir James Paget, of England, illustrate this.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Professor Gross as a young man practised in Easton, Pennsylvania, where he received fifty cents for a visit, and for out-of-town calls from one to two dollars. The consultation fee was five dollars for the first, and one dollar for each subsequent, visit.

After some years of this discouraging work, he was called to Cincinnati, Ohio, to become demonstrator of anatomy in the Medical College of Ohio. This position would naturally give him prominence in the city and State, and yet for some time he received only one dollar for local visits, and five dollars for consultations. He remained in Cincinnati seven years, and finally succeeded in building up a practice, mostly consulting, which netted him nine thousand dollars during the last year of his residence there. He then went to the University of Louisville to teach; and, his abilities gaining recognition, he had succeeded, by the time he left there in 1856, in accumulating sixty thousand dollars. His practice in Philadelphia, where he reached his zenith, was large and lucrative. His highest fee, two thousand dollars, was received in 1865 for visiting a planter in Alabama. Subsequently he received one thousand dollars for a trip to northern Alabama, involving a week's absence. His largest operating fee was one thousand dollars in a case of neuralgia. For his professorships he received, up to 1870, one hundred and ten thousand dollars, and for books eighteen thousand.

Dr. Gross was prominent in the profession of his day, a bold and skilful operator, an able and successful author, with an international reputation, and yet his largest operating fee was only a thousand dollars. Surely no one can say this great man was overpaid.

In the history of the life of Sir Astley Cooper, the celebrated surgeon of Guy's Hospital, London, it may be seen that he had an even harder struggle during the greater part of his professional life. He says:

"My receipts for the first year were five guineas; the second, £26; the third, £64; the fourth, £96; the fifth, £100; the sixth, £200; the seventh, £400; the eighth, £610; the ninth [the year he was appointed surgeon to the hospital], £1,100; although I was a lecturer all the time on anatomy and surgery."

In the year 1813, he performed lithotomy upon a Mr. Hyatt, a West Indian merchant, for which he was paid the largest fee ever

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

received up to that time for the operation. There were two physicians attending the case, and each received £300. After they had been paid and had taken their departure, Dr. Cooper visited the patient to felicitate him upon his fine recovery and bid him farewell. As he was leaving, Mr. Hyatt, it is said, took off his nightcap and threw it at the doctor, playfully saying, "There, young man, put that into your pocket." Sir Astley took out a piece of paper, and threw the nightcap back, with the remark that he could not rob Mr. Hyatt of so useful an article. The paper proved to be a check for one thousand guineas. It is related, among other eccentricities of this West Indian merchant, that one day, when his physician, Dr. Dobson, was hurriedly responding to a call from him, the physician fell and injured a knee in the sight of his patient. Mr. Hyatt immediately went to the assistance of the Doctor, saying, "Dobson, I have here the best plaster in the world for a bruised knee," whereupon he drew out a £100 bank-note and plastered it upon the injured knee.

Sir James Paget, in his Memoirs and Letters, says, "If I had died before I was forty-seven, I should have left my wife and children in extreme poverty; if I had died or become unfit for hard work before I was sixty, they would have been very poor." And this notwithstanding the fact that he worked hard sixteen hours a day, six days a week, and travelled from five to eight thousand miles in a year. His yearly income, till he had been a surgeon sixteen years, did not exceed £100. After this, it grew to £700, and gradually increased until it exceeded £10,000, falling at once to about £7,000 when he gave up operating. Thus it is seen that this famous English surgeon did not begin to receive large fees until after he was sixty, though immediately afterward he had the most lucrative practice in the United Kingdom.

The surgeon of the present day, as a rule, commands higher fees than the physician, but a hundred years ago the order was reversed.

As it has been the surgeon's fee which has evoked most criticism, this paper would not be complete did it not convey to the public some idea of the qualifications necessary to make a skilful and successful operator. To be competent to perform the varied and difficult feats of modern surgery, which ameliorate desperate conditions, cure heretofore hopeless diseases, and save hosts of valuable lives, the surgeon must be an uncommon type of man.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

A surgeon is born, not made. The quick, accurate and decisive mental analysis and deft handicraft which characterize the truly great surgeon are God-given attributes. Education and training may produce a fairly good imitation, but the true ring of the precious metal is lacking, and in trying situations the dross will show. He must bring to his life's work a master passion, which impels him ever onward, and dominates his thoughts and actions. In his mind should be a master-key that will unlock every door that bars his progress, every door that shuts out the view to the next step in a difficult operation. His clear-cut thought and unerring action open all before him in every case, and at all stages of a case, and at critical moments, when life or death wavers in the balance, his fine decision turns the scale in favor of the patient, and a precious life is saved.

To fully develop his natural gifts, he must have a liberal classical education, as well as a thorough professional one, and this entails years of student life with heavy financial outlay.

Are not the services of such a man without price?

ARTHUR C. HEFFENGER.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

THE NEW IRELAND.—VIII.

THE ECONOMIC REVIVAL

BY SYDNEY BROOKS

I DWELT in my last article on the valiant efforts that are being made to reorganize Irish agriculture on a co-operative basis. They are far from standing alone. Within the last twelve years there has been an unprecedented concentration of Irish thought, both private and official, upon problems of constructive economics. It will be convenient as well as accurate to date this new development from the summoning in 1895 of the Recess Committee. The General Election of that year had resulted in a smashing defeat for the Liberals. The feelings that had been aroused by Mr. Gladstone's Home Rule Bill of 1893 died down when it was seen that, for purposes of practical politics, Home Rule was again indefinitely postponed. Sir Horace Plunkett seized upon the momentary calm to formulate and submit to his countrymen "a proposal affecting the general welfare of Ireland." The proposal was very simple; it was only the circumstance that it was put forward in Ireland and by an Irishman that made it so momentous. Sir Horace suggested that the time had come when Unionists, without abating one jot of their Unionism, and Nationalists, without abating one jot of their Nationalism, might meet and confer upon non-partisan schemes for the material and social betterment of their common country. Economic legislation, though sorely needed by Ireland, was hopelessly unattainable unless it could be removed from the region of controversy. All parties and all creeds were at one in desiring the welfare of Ireland. They might differ on the constitutional issue, but why should that prevent them from co-operating in projects of immediate and tangible utility, projects that could be furthered with-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

out the smallest compromise of political faith? It gives the measure of Ireland's enslavement to the curse of contention that few were sanguine enough to believe that the Committee suggested by Sir Horace Plunkett could be got together. For a time the pessimists seemed on the way to be justified. Mr. Justin McCarthy, at that time the leader of the largest section of the Nationalist Party, declined to take part in any organization that put material improvement above politics. Colonel Saunderson, the dashing leader of the Irish Unionists, refused point-blank to sit on any Committee with Mr. John Redmond. Mr. Redmond himself, however, speaking for his little band of "Independents"—all that was left of the disciplined host that had once followed Parnell through thick and thin—announced his readiness to cooperate with Sir Horace Plunkett. Among the people generally the proposal met with a swift and hearty success. The Committee was formed; meeting when Parliament was not sitting, it became known as the Recess Committee; and among its members were to be found representatives, and in nearly all cases the best representatives, of every interest, class, industry, creed and party in Ireland. Orangemen and Jesuits, Unionists and Nationalists, the magnates of the industrial North, the leaders of the agricultural South and West, sat side by side in absolute harmony, and after months of exhaustive inquiry in Ireland and abroad presented a unanimous Report. Such a spectacle was unique in Irish history. For the first time practicality triumphed over bigotry and partisanship. For the first time the politicians and the men of business met and fraternized on a common platform. For the first time an economic object secured the united support of the two forces that hitherto, to the immense disadvantage of the country, had been kept apart—the force of industrial leadership on the one hand and of political leadership on the other.

The aim of the Recess Committee was to ascertain the means by which the Government could best promote the development of Ireland's agricultural and industrial resources. The substance of its recommendations was that a new Government Department, to be called the Department of Agriculture and Technical Instruction, should be created, should be adequately endowed, and should be charged with the duty of administering State aid to agriculture and industries in Ireland in such a way as to evoke and supplement, but not to supplant, self-help and individual

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

initiative. These recommendations gathered round them a large and enthusiastic body of public opinion. They were pressed upon the Government by an Ireland that seemed for the moment to have forgotten its internal feuds and to have risen from the morass of politics into the clear air of practical endeavor. The Government found itself confronted by an irresistible case that, for its own part, it was only too anxious to meet. In 1899 the Department of Agriculture and Technical Instruction became a reality. It was provided at the outset with a capital sum of about $100,000 and an annual income of slightly over $800,000 for development purposes. Its powers include the aiding, improving and developing of agriculture in all its branches; horticulture, forestry, home and cottage industries; sea and inland fisheries; the aiding and facilitating of the transit of produce; the provision of technical instruction suitable to the industrial needs of the country; and the organization of a system of education in science and art. Many scattered but co-related Boards and Departments were merged in the new Department and its constitution was expressly framed to enable the Government and the people to work together towards the building up of a more prosperous Ireland. At some risk of dulness I must dwell a little longer on this feature of its administrative framework. The members of the Recess Committee and the founders of the Department were in complete agreement that its utility depended upon the spirit and degree of its co-operation with the people. To insure this co-operation, to make it possible for the Department to labor not only for the people but with them, a constitution was devised which renders it unique among British governing bodies. Attached to the Department is a Council of Agriculture of 102 members, two-thirds of whom are appointed by the County Councils, the remainder being nominated by the Vice-President of the Department. The Council is chosen for three years; it must be convened at least once a year; and its functions are deliberative and advisory. The criticisms, suggestions and recommendations of the Council have proved to be of the greatest value to the officials of the Department. But the Council fulfils another purpose also. Once every three years it resolves itself into an Electoral College, choosing members to represent it on the Agricultural Board and on the Board of Technical Instruction. The Agricultural Board, consisting of twelve members, eight of whom are elected by the

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Council, passes upon the expenditure of all moneys from the endowment funds of the Department. Having therefore the ultimate power of the purse, it is able to check, modify and if necessary veto any policy of which it does not approve. The Board of Technical Instruction, with a rather more complex constitution, has precisely the same powers in relation to its special province. It is clear that machinery, so unusual and elaborate as this, can only be worked at all if it is pervaded by the right spirit. It is clear also that, given the right spirit, it presents a singularly acute and inspiriting union of administrative efficiency and popular control. But the Department is a democratic body, not only in its organization, but in its *modus operandi*. The Act creating it empowered the local County, Borough and District Councils to appoint committees, partly elective and partly co-optive, for the purpose of carrying out such of the Department's schemes as are of local and not of general importance; and to participate in these schemes the local authorities must themselves contribute to the cost of financing them. In this way the Department is brought and kept in touch with the needs of each district without losing its centralized efficiency and the principle of local effort and local co-operation is effectively preserved.

Nearly all the administrative Boards in Ireland are not Irish but English, alien institutions framed after the Whitehall model, largely manned by Englishmen and, whether useful or not, symbols to the Irish mind of a foreign and uncongenial rule. But the Department of Agriculture represents not only a concession won by argument and persuasion instead of agitation, but an effort of purely native thought applied to national economics. The people know it to be their very own; their attitude towards it is wholly different from their attitude towards any other administrative establishment in the country; it enters their daily lives and businesses as a friend and not as a stranger; and I think it a most hopeful and significant fact that this, almost the first, application of Irish ideas to the problems of Irish government should have resulted in the creation of a Department that is not only a variation from the normal type, but in range, efficiency and responsiveness to the real needs of the country far surpasses any similar Department in the British Isles. Most of the credit of this achievement must go to Sir Horace Plunkett. He not only conceived the Department, but was its first working head.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

and the principles which guided him through its early critical years were the only ones compatible with genuine and lasting improvement. Ireland being a country where the politicians and the masses are alike almost destitute of economic knowledge and where the facile view that the State is responsible for the welfare of the people is most greedily accepted, it asked courage to risk unpopularity by going slow, by refraining from spoon-feeding, by keeping strictly to the fundamental principle of helping the people to help themselves, and by insisting that instruction must take precedence of doles and subsidies. Happily for Ireland, Sir Horace Plunkett possessed this courage. Under his guidance the Department became the one radiating centre in the vast circumference of Irish officialdom of sound economic thought and practice. I cannot attempt even a *précis* of its multitudinous activities. They cover the whole field of agriculture and technical instruction and even though the experimental period cannot yet be regarded as closed—the Department has only been in existence for eight years—it is not too early to say that there is not a branch of agriculture or of technical instruction that is not the better for its existence. The foundations have been well and truly laid; the youngest of the Irish Departments is already the most useful.

It has had to contend with many obstacles. A certain amount of friction between the Department and the local committees was at first inevitable. The idea of State aid following instead of preceding voluntary and individual exertions had to be popularized. Many wild misconceptions as to the means, objects and powers of the Department had to be removed. The unorganized condition of most of the Irish farmers and the backwardness of primary education made the preliminary task of explanation and of forming workable relations with the agriculturists of any given district an arduous and protracted proceeding. Above all, the Nationalist politicians who had at first blessed the Department soon began to curse it, to obstruct its development, and to do what they could to turn the people against it. Their chief, almost their sole, conception of economic policy is a system under which the State by grants and subsidies does everything for the people and the people do nothing for the State except to open their pockets a little wider. When they found that the Department was determined to insist upon local endeavor as a condition of official co-operation and assistance, they frantically assailed

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

it because in seven years it had not repaired the ravages of seven centuries. Then, again, it was a grievous disappointment to them to find that Sir Horace Plunkett chose his officers with merit and efficiency as his single test and was neither to be cajoled nor coerced into providing soft posts for political hangers-on. Moreover, as I explained in the preceding article, the Department subsidized the co-operative movement to which the publicans and "gombeen-men," by whose favor many of the Nationalist M.P.'s hold their seats, are violently hostile. Sir Horace Plunkett, furthermore, had built up, through the Department and the local elected committees and through the co-operative societies, an organization which was absolutely non-political and which the Nationalist "machine" was desperately anxious to capture. And besides all this he had published a book which Mr. Redmond brazenly described as "full of undisguised contempt for the Irish race," which the priests, and especially those who had not read it, fell instantly foul of, and which was undoubtedly the means of creating a great deal of foolish prejudice against him. Add to the list of these offences that Sir Horace Plunkett is a Protestant and a Unionist and his vulnerability in the *mêlée* of Irish public life is easily appreciated.

But the Nationalist opposition to him and to his work fetched a wider compass and was based on more general grounds than any I have as yet indicated. It is one of the most deplorable features of the Nationalists' propaganda that they resent any attempt to promote Irish welfare from within. They consistently act as though the demand for Home Rule were in inverse proportion to Irish prosperity and as though an Ireland that was helped too far along the path of agricultural and industrial progress would grow indifferent to the national question. The only thing, they declare, which can ever restore prosperity to Ireland is Home Rule; and when this fallacy is disproved by the spectacle of Irishmen increasing their well-being by their own efforts, they at once declare that it is the result of a conspiracy to turn the minds of the people from the constitutional issue. This must seem so wildly absurd to the practicality of Americans and to their sense of proportion that I feel bound to justify what I have written by quotations from two of the acknowledged leaders of the Irish Party. Mr. Redmond when he left New York in October, 1904, wrote a letter to the Editor of the "Irish World"

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

warning Americans against "an insidious attempt" which was "being made in America by officials and agents of the British Government to divert the minds of the friends of Ireland from the National movement under the pretence of promoting an industrial revival in Ireland." "I myself," added the leader of the Irish Party, "at one time entertained some belief in the good intentions of Sir Horace Plunkett and his friends, but recent events have entirely undeceived me; and Sir Horace Plunkett's recent book . . . makes it plain to me that the real object of the movement in question is to undermine the National Party and divert the minds of our people from Home Rule, which is the only thing which can ever lead to a real revival of Irish industries." Mr. John Dillon, a far more influential man in Ireland than Mr. Redmond, is even more vehement in his antagonism to anything that promises to make Ireland more prosperous and more businesslike. "I have been criticised more than once," he said in November, 1906, "because I have been hostile to the whole machine which is controlled by Sir Horace Plunkett. Why have I been hostile to it? Because I know from my own knowledge that it is from top to bottom a machine to burst up and destroy the National Party and the National movement. It comes like a wolf in sheep's clothing. Its agents go among the people as the promoters of industry; but the real object of the whole business is to break up the National Party and to prepare the way for Devolution." There is nothing to be added by way of comment on these preposterous and deliberate absurdities except to remark that they reflect but too truthfully the common attitude of the Irish Party towards all endeavors on behalf of internal betterment. It has become a fixed habit with the leaders of that Party to denounce all such endeavors as political conspiracies.

For these reasons the Nationalist M.P.'s set themselves to thwart Sir Horace Plunkett and the Department by every means in their power. They hindered but they could not destroy the admirable work he initiated—the people accepted, welcomed and utilized it too eagerly for that. But they could and did get rid of Sir Horace Plunkett himself. The one serious blot in the Act creating the Department of Agriculture was the clause providing that its Vice-President and working head should be a member of the Government and therefore a Member of Parliament. At the time the Department was launched Sir Horace

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Plunkett was in Parliament. He lost his seat, however, at the election of 1900. The Unionist Government, nevertheless, requested him to remain in his post. The Council of Agriculture, composed, as I have said, of two-thirds elected members, virtually all of whom are Nationalists, seconded the request. Sir Horace Plunkett repeatedly offered to resign if they gave the word, but this representative body of Irish farmers, knowing his value and the value of his work, as repeatedly invited him to remain. When the Liberal Government came into power in 1906 Sir Horace Plunkett, though a political opponent, was asked to continue in office until a specially appointed Committee had inquired into the workings and constitution of the Department. The Nationalists, however, could contain themselves no longer. They closed round Mr. Birrell, demanding Sir Horace Plunkett's dismissal; and Mr. Birrell, notwithstanding that the Report of the Committee was in his hands and that it specifically recommended that the Vice-Presidency should be made a non-Parliamentary post, gave way. Sir Horace was turned out and Mr. T. W. Russell, once a Unionist politician and now almost, if not quite, a Home Ruler, a man of great fire and zeal but wholly unversed in practical agricultural problems, was installed in his place. I have narrated this unsavory incident at length in order that Americans may appreciate the sort of obstacles that a constructive reformer has to contend with in Ireland at the hands of the professed friends and representatives of the Irish people. The Nationalists have had their way and Mr. Russell is now administering the Department with the looked-for regard for political susceptibilities. None the less, though the danger of a lapse into the disastrous policy of spoon-feeding is not altogether passed, the Department remains the most original and beneficial institution in Ireland and, so long as as it is developed along the lines laid down by its originators, cannot help contributing with increasing success to an all-round raising of the standards of economic thought, of industrial preparation, of agricultural practice and of rural living throughout Ireland.

But it is not in agriculture alone that one feels the stir and straining of an upward lift. All over Ireland sounds the hum of practical endeavor, with an undertone of almost feverish poignancy. There is something in it of the passion of a religious revival expressing itself in the dry terms of industrial economics. Nowhere

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

have I met so many men and women so consumed with the ambition to "do something" for their country. I dare not say that their activities are always working along the soundest lines or that many of them do not confuse benevolence with beneficence. But the spirit behind them is admirable, and now less than ever can Ireland afford to see it relaxed. There are many aspects from which, so far from having passed the crisis of her fate, Ireland may be said to be just entering it. The policy of land purchase has laid the foundations of a new social order of peasant proprietors, but the superstructure to be erected on those foundations depends on the efforts of the Irish people themselves and cannot be determined by any external agency whatsoever. And even when every instrument of agricultural co-operation, of technical instruction, of State assistance acting upon local enterprise, of migration and resettlement, has been pressed into service—even then only a beginning will have been made. Without more industries and manufactures, without the extension of handicrafts subsidiary to agriculture, without a levelling-up of the whole scale of rural life, Ireland can hardly win her way to the prosperity she deserves. The problem of Irish development has lost something of its old political bitterness, only to take on a yet more stringent economical acuteness. The appalling drain of emigration still goes on. The Lunacy Commissioners and the Health Statistics tell a tale of even more sinister omen. The 200,000 uneconomic holdings remain more or less as they were. The crushed industrial instinct has yet to be revived. Capital still seeks the savings-bank. Taxation, direct and indirect, still awaits readjustment. The high natural capacities of the people, their quick intelligence, their industry—or should I rather say their latent faculty for industry?—have still to be made effective. In spite of everything men feel that Ireland is in peril of sinking into a stupor worse than death. With the intentness of doctors round a bed of sickness, they are striving and wrestling for a desperate recovery.

I wish I could pass their heroic efforts under microscopic review. But here a broad and rapid glance must suffice. There has been of late years a testing of many of the shafts and cranks of the Dublin Castle machinery. The Irish railways and the administration of the poor-law, the workings of the Congested Districts Board—the Board that has practically built up from

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

nothing the fisheries on the western coast and is conducting on land, under inconceivable difficulties and on somewhat dubious principles, a vast experiment in the migration and transplantation of the peasants and in the conversion of small barren holdings into moderate-sized farms—the Department of Agriculture, and the practicability of reafforestation, have all alike been inquired into. But the official fermentation is as nothing to the unofficial. Go where you will, even into the heart of desolate Mayo, and you do not get beyond its scope. Every town and county seems to have its Industrial Development Association; every paper seems to be urging upon the public the duty of preferring Irish manufactures. Openings for new industries and the revival of old ones are zealously canvassed. The resources of the country are being brought one by one under fresh and open-minded examination. You find a priest here who has raised $30,000 to start a woollen mill. You find a duchess there who has founded a co-operative creamery, and an earl's wife somewhere else who has revived in her neighborhood the homespun tweed industry. The vast extension of Irish lace-making owes more to Lady Aberdeen than to any one else. Mr. Birrell can hardly stir outside the Secretary's Lodge in Phœnix Park without somebody trying to pick his official pocket for a new railway or a pier or Government aid to this enterprise and to that. It all, I suppose, helps. Some of it perhaps would make one suspect that there is a danger of industrial development becoming a social fad. A good deal of it, too, is ill-regulated and has more relation to sentiment and philanthropy than to commercial principles. But it keeps the question alive, and it creates an atmosphere that favors the solid achievements of practical men. To get a few shop-windows dressed with Irish goods, to win an Irish trade-mark from officialdom, to expose foreign manufacturers who try to palm off their wares as Irish, and to pass resolutions denouncing public bodies for their remissness in not patronizing Irish furniture and Irish ink exclusively, does not sound like a very hopeful form of activity. But it has, no doubt, its use in propagating a sustained and pervasive interest in the country's material needs and difficulties; it turns thought in an economic direction; it fosters the new tendency towards the concrete and the practical.

SYDNEY BROOKS.

(To be continued.)

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

NEW BOOKS REVIEWED.

BY CHRISTIAN GAUSS, ALVAN F. SANBORN AND CHARLOTTE L. RUDYARD.

"THE INTERPRETATION OF LIFE."*

DISBELIEF in the phenomenal is as old as our oldest myths, the Fall of Man or the sacred books of the Hindus. Not only have we no valid knowledge, but our own natures seem to have imposed upon us an unreal phantom world of shadows in which we must shape our lives and hunt our destinies. The prospect is not alluring, certainly. With this attitude toward the problem of knowledge, it is not to be wondered at that a whole army of nineteenth-century students has stood bemused at the "grotesque industry" of our scientists and the disconcerting silence of our philosophers. In the general disaccord between scientists and philosophers, certain of the former, like Haeckel, have turned philosophical and have attempted to give us purely material explanations of the world. On the other hand, Professor James has recently offered us his Pragmatism, which, likewise evading the problem of ultimate reality, is but a method and not a philosophy. We have asked for bread and they have given us stones.

In the remarkable work of Dr. Gerhardt C. Mars, "The Interpretation of Life," the writer would prove to us in his main contentions three things; first, that there is reality, and that this reality is knowable; secondly, he is concerned with giving us the attributes of this "substantial causal unity," as he terms it; and, thirdly, he would show what ought to be our relation to this primal unity of cause and substance. It is a large programme and conceived in a large spirit; not a bit of tidy eclecticism, a mere setting together of old mosaics of

* "The Interpretation of Life." By Gerhardt C. Mars, Ph.D. New York: D. Appleton & Company.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

thought, but an attempt to construct nothing less than a new cogent, coherent system of philosophy. In the course of his eight hundred rather closely printed pages, he enters practically all the fields of the philosophic discipline and discusses nearly all philosophic problems; the epistemological, the metaphysical, the æsthetic and the ethical. In the accomplishment of this task, Dr. Mars deploys a vast erudition. He has evidently followed closely the developments in modern biological and physical science; his chapter on art is one of the best in his book, and he has laid under contribution the works of the philosophers of every time and clime. Nearly all the ancient and modern "masters of those who know" must cross his stage and be challenged. In his large work the thoughts of Greek and Hindu jostle. There are chapter-heads on Christ and Gautama; long discussions of the mystic Swedenborg and Mrs. Eddy, and Balzac is ranked as a philosopher with Leibnitz and Spinoza. Dr. Mars has broken down the matter of philosophic systems, and it is plain that he has taken his goods where he found them. His work is earnest and sincere and conceived in a spirit of lofty idealism. It is in any case an interesting effort, and if in some of his main contentions it may seem to us that he has failed, he has at least, like Phaethon, gone down having dared great things, *magnis tamen excidit ausis.* The work is written with a refreshing courage and assurance. When he touches upon those problems which to him, and we dare say to all of us, are most vital, Dr. Mars can write eloquently, as in his chapter on the evolution of the ethical reason; and his worst sins are certain minor, but repeated, offences against a tyrannical English grammar that are reprehensible only because they might have been so easily corrected, and which, with the numerous typographical errors, may be laid where they belong—at the door of a careless proof-reader.

His work falls into six main divisions or books. In the "Natural World Order," Dr. Mars is dealing with the world of the scientists, from the lowest forms to self-conscious man. This world he finds governed by harmonious laws and showing everywhere evidences of teleological evolution—that is, to him "evolution is a rational, purposive progress toward a definite end." With this view of evolution, Dr. Mars will find his first quarrel with scientists like Haeckel and De Vries, though it will doubtless be accepted by most readers. In his second book, "The Supra-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Natural World Order," he deals with the development of man as a self-conscious ego who, understanding the intimate relation and harmony between himself as a rational personality and the world as the manifestation of another and higher Reason, is to find his fullest life and realization in thinking the Cosmic Thought, in evaluating and imitating the Cosmic Beauty and Power, and in reconciling himself with the Cosmic Will of Goodness. In the "Threefold Unity of Reason," he deals with the inseparable connection between man's three faculties of knowing, feeling and willing. In the "Threefold Interpretation of Reason," we are given the processes and demands of knowledge, feeling and will, and their ultimate satisfaction in the apprehension of Reality. Book five, on the "Pedagogy of Pain," treats of the discipline of Life, in which Pain is made "the rebuke in terms of feeling, which Truth and Goodness invariably visit upon the unreality of error and sin, of mistakes in thought and perversities of will, for all disturbed bodily conditions indicate some false thought or wrong volition in the organic idea." Here, too, the atonement of Christ is treated as the logical culmination of this doctrine. In the sixth book, "The Realization," we are shown how Christian Science is the highest development of this Theistic Monism, that it is at once Christian and scientific and that it harmonizes perfectly with the Cosmic order.

As a personal confession, we may say that we read the first two divisions of Dr. Mars's book with much interest, for he offers to deal with grave problems, the chasm between Christian theory and practice, for instance, and the moral absurdity of the social order. He points the way toward a satisfactory solution in his "Evolution of the Ethical Reason," a really eloquent chapter based on Pauline theology and the history of man's development as a self-conscious being.

We began to grow suspicious of his terminology when he started to speak of the "Supra-Natural World Order," with the tacit implication that there are for us two such world orders; a difficulty which for himself he later overcomes by denying all validity or objective reality to the natural order, and making the supra-natural or "rational" order first co-extensive (as an activity in mind, p. 469) and then identical with mind *(ibid)*. Spirit, or, as Dr. Mars usually calls it, mind, is thus made the basis of a monistic system. In this he is, of course, not alone. He departs

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

from other idealistic monists in his discussions of the nature of this substantial causal unity and in his convictions that the individual mind is potentially, and can be made practically, coextensive with this "supra-natural mind," which is true and beautiful and good. By thinking the cosmic thought and willing the cosmic will we can thus escape all the contradictions, error, sin, pain and disease of this troubled but really immaterial world of appearances. "Thought must deny the reality of all sense knowledge as the arch error" (p. 691). On this basis it is, of course, an easy matter to justify the practical aspects of Christian Science. Since such mind is the only reality, it is at once cause and cure, and we are once more in Hegel's night in which all cows are black.

It will be remembered that Kant's critical philosophy allows us valid knowledge only within the limits of a possible sense experience, and thus validates mathematical and physical science. Dr. Mars turns Kant completely about and allows us valid knowledge only of what he calls the supra-natural world order, thus invalidating our present science and giving credentials only to his own. We lose touch with him after the introduction of his rational intuition as an organon of knowledge. It is this faculty, unknown to Kant, which gives him knowledge of "objective reality," of God, man and the world. Dr. Mars has understated Kant's philosophy, for he neglects to discuss one of the most important phases of his system, the antinomies of reason, and makes no mention of the conclusions in the "Critique of Judgment" with its apparent reconciliation between the worlds of reason and the understanding. After Dr. Mars's departure from Kant, nearly all of his conclusions go back to these "rational intuitions." "It is only from the standpoint of rational intuition, intellectual, moral and æsthetic, that we catch glimpses of rational meaning in the unfolding process, which brings with it the mystery and the burden of suffering; or can see a divine purpose of good in the 'Pedagogy of Pain'" (p. 473).

By assuming rational intuition as an organon of knowledge, Dr. Mars, instead of solving, merely dismisses that whole problem at which Kant worked so earnestly. Until Dr. Mars can show that his rational intuitions have universal validity, they deserve no place in a philosophy which attempts to deal with the problems of knowledge. As it is, the conclusions assumed by this faculty

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

have no more value, philosophically, than Kant's judgments of sense on the lower plane. If you like olives and your friend does not, you cannot prove to him that olives are good, for him, by describing your sensations. It is much the same with these rational intuitions, and we read the remaining books of Dr. Mars's metaphysical treatise as we might read a novel, but with this difference: that we much prefer these lofty romances of the human mind.

Fundamentally as we disagree with many of Dr. Mars's conclusions, we believe that so long as these problems exist such earnest attempts to solve them cannot be useless. He at least brings to consciousness many of the contradictions of our social order and he thinks nobly of man. In concluding we can do no better than to quote a passage characteristic in its earnestness and sincerity. It occurs in his chapter on the ethical reason, a chapter which every earnest student of our social problems ought to read. In it he transcends the rather gaunt morality of Kant, and in his conclusions here we agree with Dr. Mars most heartily.

"Though, by the utmost care, I should reduce all my actions to universal rules, I might still remain morally dead. For true morality is not any specific set of actions, according to rules, but the simple inner impulse of good-will. 'Without love I am nothing,' so far as my true moral life is concerned. The supreme moral question for me is always: Shall I as a scientist, knowing nature, and, as an artist appreciating and mastering her values, will to appropriate the goods of life for myself or, with an outstreaming will of good, share them with others?

"The universal moral law, then, is not the 'categorical imperative,' or even the Golden Rule, of which it is an abstract statement, but that deeper and more inclusive law: 'Love thy neighbor as thyself.' Deeper and more inclusive, because, while in the former I look to the condition or act of another for my standard of duty; in the latter, I look simply to the universal obligation of good-will within my own heart. Such is the ultimate law of the ethical reason, for it is, to use St. Paul's fine expression, that love which 'is the fulfilling of the law.'"

CHRISTIAN GAUSS.

"RALPH WALDO EMERSON—SA VIE ET SON OEUVRE."*

ON his first trip to Europe in 1832, at twenty-nine years of age, Emerson travelled in Sicily, Italy, France and England on a more or less conscious quest of the master, the prophet, whose

* "Ralph Waldo Emerson—Sa Vie et Son Œuvre." By M. Dugard. 8vo., pp. 418. Illustrated. Librairie Armand Colin.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

wisdom should clear up the mysteries which then obscured his soul. In Paris, he heard Jouffroy and Gay-Lussac lecture, and presented letters of introduction to a number of French thinkers of note; but he was too young, too diffident, and too little familiar with the French language to make his personality felt.

On the occasion of his last visit to Europe in 1872, ten years before his death, he found that his fame had preceded him. Taine, Renan and other French thinkers vied with one another in doing him honor, and, four years later, he was elected a corresponding member of one of the *Académies* of the Institute of France.

At the present time, the name of Emerson is as familiar to cultivated Frenchmen as are the names of Poe, Hawthorne, Cooper, Thoreau and Whitman. But, curiously enough, "Representative Men" is the only one of Emerson's volumes which has been translated into French (*"Les Surhumains,"* Jean Izoulet, 1895); and, except for casual perfunctory references in handbooks and histories of philosophy and literature, surprisingly little has been written about him. Two articles in the *"Revue des Deux Mondes,"* by Emile Montégut (1847 and 1850), a brochure by A. Levoz (1890), an article in the *"Revue des Deux Mondes,"* by Roz (1902), and an essay by Maeterlinck in *"Trésor des Humbles,"* comprise about all the important French Emersoniana. The consequence is that the personality and the writings of the "Sage of Concord" are practically unknown in France, except to the relatively few who possess a working knowledge of the English language.

M. Dugard's work evidently responds, therefore, to a long-felt need; and, as the first French attempt to give a comprehensive biography and interpretation of Emerson, it is attracting an attention which it would not otherwise have attracted, perhaps, although its intrinsic merit is unquestionably considerable.

Since it is inevitable that a book about an eminent American written by a foreigner and intended primarily for foreigners should contain much that is familiar to Americans, it would be superfluous to review the contents of M. Dugard's "Emerson" in detail; under these circumstances, a simple transcription of the principal conclusions of the author should suffice.

In general, M. Dugard's attitude is sympathetic without being sycophantic, admiring without being indiscriminately adoring.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

He occupies persistently and consistently a middle ground between the detractors and the panegyrists of his subject. He admits that the thought of Emerson was not always clear; that he appeals only to a minority; that, as a writer, he is unequal and not without faults; that he refuses to look the evil in the world squarely in the eye; that he is exasperatingly indifferent to the cries of suffering humanity; that he is often lacking in warmth; that he is totally lacking in the historic sense; that he has proclaimed no new principles; that he has reconciled no antinomies; and that he is not entirely foreign to "the development in the United States of a whole literature [Spiritualism, Christian Science and New Thought seem here to be aimed at] of an insipid and incoherent mysticism in which slovenliness seems to be considered a mark of genius, and in which quietism and the joy of living are childishly celebrated. But, in spite of these limitations (which are, properly speaking, scarcely limitations, since they relate to matters that have no essential connection with his dominant purpose), it is M. Dugard's verdict that Emerson "was very great and wrought a great and good work." He realized his sole ambition and fulfilled his unique rôle, which was "to reanimate moral sentiment" by revealing constantly "the ideal and holy life."

More specifically, Emerson's principal achievements were as follows:

> "First of all, he aided his country to become itself. Without him, the New World, satisfied with having achieved political liberty, would have remained for a long time under the intellectual domination of the Old World. It was his individualistic teaching, especially his lecture on the 'American Scholar' (a veritable declaration of the moral independence of the United States) which roused American intellect to a consciousness of its force and delivered it from the imitation of Europe."

Emerson was a precursor as well as an emancipator. In the political field, at a time when democracy was exalting, in the flush of recent victory, the sovereignty of the people, he pointed out that "tyranny, whether exercised by the crowd, by a single person or by a few, is always tyranny" and "opposed to levelling majorities the rights of the individual." In the educational field, "at a time when everybody still believed in the necessity of Greek and Latin and in the virtue of uniform programmes, he made it clear that there is no absolute correlation between the

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

knowledge of dead tongues and liberal culture, and claimed for every person the right to choose the studies for which he is specially endowed. The American school owes to him the group system of electives adopted later in Europe." Furthermore, "the novelties" of the historian "who no longer conceives the recital of the past as a narrative of the wars of kings, but as an exposition of the development of ideas and of peoples," of the artist who "seeks forms of beauty corresponding to the needs of modern civilization," and of the believer who "talks of the 'evolution of dogmas' and sees in theology the expression of truth immutable in essence but subject to revision of form from age to age" appeared in his works more than half a century ago. But he was especially a precursor in his general attitude toward life.

"He changed what is called to-day 'the scale of values.' In his time, docility, resignation, the spirit of order and respect for official truths were esteemed above everything. . . . For this ecclesiastical or bourgeois conception, he substituted the ideal of the individual who *is*, of the hero who dares to look everything in the face, of the spiritual man, who, deriving new force from his relations with the Infinite, continues the action of the Divine and refashions the world according to his dream."

Emerson was a preacher (and practiser) of the "simple life," of "plain living and high thinking," with whom, of American writers, only Thoreau and Whitman are worthy to be compared, and beside whom the French Pastor Wagner [over whose puerile commonplaces the American people recently went wild, because, forsooth, our *Theodorus Arbiter* commended them] is the veriest pigmy.

Emerson had a limitless faith in man which he possessed a marvellous faculty for communicating. Hence, notwithstanding his theory of passivity, he acted as a powerful moral stimulant. He exerted a tremendous influence upon a whole generation of Americans in both the lay and religious worlds, and, during the latter part of his life he was recognized as a force in Europe. "There are few English and German writers who, at some period of their lives, have not come more or less under the spell of the great American thinker," affirms M. Dugard. "We shall have the proofs," he adds, "when the memoirs and the correspondence of the authors of the second part of the nineteenth century shall have been published."

As to whether the action of Emerson upon the world shall be

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

greater or less as time goes on, M. Dugard is very careful not to commit himself. Regarding this mooted point he writes:

"Is Emerson's influence destined to increase? Will Emerson be esteemed one day a classic author, an educator of Humanity? Certain of his compatriots are sure that such will be the case. For them, 'the Sage of Concord' towers above America like a giant dominating time and space. They indorse without reserve the words of Bronson Alcott and of Edward Everett Hale, who predicted for him universal glory. 'May not Emerson, like Plato, rather be one of those philosophers who, from age to age, encounter only a dozen real readers?' query certain others. Is it possible that the moralists of a world whose traditions date only from yesterday and which is ignorant of the difficulties of the old civilizations have lessons for all the peoples? In France, notably, where the craving for pure reason is so strong that it appears easier to pass from Christianity to the Positive Philosophy than to stop at any form whatsoever of spirituality, will not Emerson's mysticism always be an obstacle to the diffusion of his thought? To these questions one knows not what to answer. The only thing one may venture to affirm with confidence is that, wherever there shall be souls upon whom the mediocre palls, Emerson will be greeted as a friend—for no one gives to the same extent as he, new reasons for loving life and for making it better."

ALVAN F. SANBORN.

"THE TESTING OF DIANA MALLORY."*

THERE can be little question that any estimate of the work of Mrs. Humphry Ward during her lifetime will be deflected from the consideration of her art to the appreciation of her representative character as a British citizen and a British matron; nor can this fail to give a proper pleasure to the public and to Mrs. Ward, even though it cost the price of a clearer criticism of her work. In both realms, personal and public, Mrs. Ward is distinctly British; energetic, purposeful, attached to a cause and tenacious in it, capable of much devotion to make it prevail. Each expression of her thought shows an absence of morbidity, a deliberate pleasure in the idea that material vicissitudes are temporary, and a thorough faith in the doctrine of race-conscience, which we are happy to associate with the Anglo-Saxon. This is a blend pleasing to the taste of the solid citizen body, and pro-

* "The Testing of Diana Mallory." By Mrs. Humphry Ward. New York: Harper & Brothers.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

ductive of a reading public that does not fluctuate and receives with steady nerves every successive story of human affection.

Mrs. Ward is a writer who from novel to novel has given expression to some contemporary issue of British popular concern; it may be orthodoxy in "Robert Elsmere," social philanthropy in "Marcella," or personal ethics in "Lady Rose's Daughter." The public respects her novels in advance and reads them with assurance. She stands like a sheltered light in an open place where other flames are extinguished in the wind. When she publishes a book she reminds us of a personage visiting a territory where a few are allowed to pass unquestioned. In short, Mrs. Ward, wherever she may journey in the land of the novel, is believed to be on a reliable mission, and respectfully treated as one under the protection of her country's literary flag.

As Mrs. Ward herself is pledged to be typically English, so the question involved in "The Testing of Diana Mallory" is as truly posed from the English point of view. The man who forsakes a woman who loves him and is his promised wife at the moment of her grief and disgrace for a dead parent's crime is easily characterized in real life. In fiction he is at least the modern type of the unheroic hero at full blush. It must be that one is called upon to consider palliating circumstances.

Your cultivated Briton regards marriage as a religious institution, but not exclusively; he knows it, albeit scarcely so thoroughly as the Frenchman, for a biologic expedient besides. He observes that the race is perpetuated, preserved and regulated by it, and he chooses the woman whom he elects to be partner with him in the process as a potential mother. That before the vision of most men love itself slips over the woman the halo of imagined perfect motherhood is only a divine circumstance whereby marriage becomes possible, and not a refutation of its reasoning. All the stress of material living urges the union of equal parts, while a mésalliance due to defect in moral lineage is more appealing when it destroys social prestige. Perhaps this also is a little British. Yet it may as well be admitted that in any social whole where politics and society are as two sides of a shield, the part played by the wife is multiplied by two; that socially dowered she is like so much capital to her husband, and if she carries a handicap she furnishes him with a halter. Lady Lucy Marsham was a good mother; she was also a zealous biologist. Oliver, her son,

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

was a detestable cad, and in addition aspired to be a statesman. Between them they agreed to sacrifice Diana for the general good of Oliver, and Diana agreed to it, too.

It is not a new fictive invention, the sins of the fathers, but like a sacred symbol it may be counted upon to scourge the sympathies. When Mrs. Ward adopts it for a theme she swings away from historical plots, albeit not yet quite far enough from politics, into a path of pure sentiment, there to discover an idyllic heroine, all-deserving of joy and all-distressed.

The testing of Diana Mallory is not altogether spiritual. It grows out of the most worldly of all reverses, the disgrace of a scandal. It brings about the kind of suffering which results from the press of circumstances, not from any conflict in desire or will, nor from what Joseph Conrad has called a "combat with the secret baseness of motives." Deeper, for this reason, the tragedy of Juliet Sparling, the mother, not because a wild blow made of her a murderess, but because she bore the consciousness of a wrong that was her own; whereas the crime of a mother without intention, the death of a father without warning, the desertion of a lover without cause, the abuse of a vulgar cousin without provocation, compose such a burden of grief as gathers naturally on the shoulders of Atlas and may drop upon any passer-by. The test for which this girl's experience does serve is the test of every other character in the book. One old woman is raised to the highest exponent of worldliness and reduced to zero; another young one, out of an almost automatic vulgarity precipitates a single decent moment, doubtless the first of her life; one old man renders up a living service for the sake of the unforgotten dead; another marshals an independence not often given to the sex—a friendship with one woman which is impregnable against the prejudice of another woman whom he loves; and a younger man, Diana's mate by every test of reasonable love, were love reasonable, comes to that compromise with the ideal wherein a man's dream-woman having passed from his reach, he is self-persuaded to hold out empty hands for second best.

Then while this Lady Lucy mother is upsetting herself over the risk to her son, the rest of us are disposed to resent Diana's loving him at all. It may be argued that this is the fault of the author for not contriving him so that his charm, if not his worth, is apparent; for indeed, except that the two draw mental

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

fire in a political argument, there is no indicated ground for their attachment. On the contrary, Diana, a woman of warm-blooded ideals, sees Marsham violate every one of them,—loyalty, fair dealing, all degrees of honor, even the common decency imposed on a man in his public treatment of a woman. If it be not true that a high-minded girl could not have loved this kind of man, an argument somewhat artificial in face of the fact that such a girl usually does, one is roused to insist that having loved him she would before the last page outgrow the love. We have been somehow persuaded that to survive the fiery furnace one must use the other door in stepping out, whereas to go wholly through and out at the other end may indeed be a finer experience, but it is also less common. A truer plea would be that love that could live under insult to self, could die with ease under the knowledge of treachery, such as Marsham's was to Ferrier, of another.

Against all such arguments we hasten to place a single one in the balance, the old-fashioned conceit, agreeably tolerated in ballad form, that the heart that has truly loved never forgets, but as truly loves on to the close. This sentiment we profess to applaud, and are not quite convinced of our own sincerity. Rather, "Hell hath no fury" has become a dignified tradition among us. The woman scorned who fails to behave that way not only astonishes another woman, but disturbs a certain sense of fitness in the man. A demand that she remember the outrage of her injury is instinctive. Happiness itself takes on an infamous hue if to save it from smothering to death the lady has stepped from the pedestal of her wrong. There is this little theatric pulse in the heart of love. Too many times it has inspired a tragic play wherein the actors, enchanted, turn into their own audience, and the curtain goes down at all costs on one last scene which the Master Builder's Hilda would call "frightfully thrilling."

This heroine of Mrs. Ward's is noticeably defective in stage heroics. When the man she loved put her away from his arms she let him do that; and when he folded them about her again she let him do that too. Her desire was that of the woman since the world began—to fulfil his desire of her.

Then she was only a comfortable little hedonist, Diana, after all, securing her happiness; securing it unselfishly, but securing it, nevertheless. Is there nothing deeper in it, then, than this?

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

There is an exquisite perception of youth that comes rarely, the conquering knowledge that the pearl is worth the price because in the whole of life there is nothing else worth purchasing. We recall a certain phrasing of it by an uncle of Mrs. Ward—Matthew Arnold:

> "Ah love, let us be true
> To one another! for the world which seems
> To lie before us like a land of dreams . . .
> Hath really neither joy, nor love, nor light,
> Nor certitude, nor peace, nor help for pain."

This is confession wrung dry of pride, this passionate call of youth to youth for surrender under a prescience of impending pain that shall be futile. The man Marsham admitted it as one taught by the world when it turned against him; the woman, who had nothing to do with the world, as one whose hunger was of that naïve order, almost forgotten in the modern confusion of appetites, which is perfectly willing to be fed. She might have said like a child, "You did take away my food when I was hungry, but you have brought it back—and I am still hungry."

Surely we have some reason to be grateful for a heroine who, being capable of so much compassion for every other character in the world, is reasonable enough to include in that compassion herself. Contrariwise, we have great cause to regret that, having in a campaign of retribution driven Fate herself to cover, Mrs. Ward ends her march at a sick-bed. After such a drubbing of defeat and besmirchment as Oliver Marsham, M.P., was led to suffer, the very literary notion of physical pain should have suggested anti-climax. It is a thousand pities that the candid splendor of Diana's visit, so straightforward and unhesitating, should be diminished by an expedient which a woman less noble than Miss Mallory, a writer less conventional than Mrs. Ward, might have demanded as an excuse for the lovers' meeting that insures the journey's end. The sick-bed is properly a resort for authors who drape happy futures upon their characters in such a manner as to avoid all nakedness of pride; and from this there seems to be no relief whatever, until the rest of us, situated on an island of imagination entirely surrounded by real life, are driven to sigh for some friendly accident whereby we too may possess our lover or win back our friend.

It seems quite positive that Mrs. Ward did not work out her

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

conclusion for the sake of a happy ending. On the contrary, she exhibits the conviction that romance should rightly come to this, and so perhaps it should as long as our stories are made to end with the wedding day. When modern social life has evolved a psychology to show that marriage is properly the beginning of drama, that then only are the relations of men and women capable of the deepest complexities, we shall inaugurate a comedy to which the romance of courtship will have been but a lyric prelude. If the fallen curtain of this novel were to go up again after marriage, we should regard this story differently, perhaps, but then we should regard most stories differently. The indignant woman who hoped for the sake of Mrs. Ward's motherhood—the British matron again!—that she would repent having given this woman in marriage to this man overlooked two useful facts. One is that in the refusal of Diana to marry Marsham we might have had the amusing anomaly of Diana in half-duplicate of Lady Lucy, fearing lest the weakness of the father reproduce itself in the children. The other is that the woman who would find marriage with Marsham a disappointment and a humiliation would be a woman whom unmanliness would offend to the death, and Diana had already proved herself not that kind of woman.

"He was not love-worthy, therefore she loved him." Thus to counterphrase Heine is not merely to point the relations of this hero to this heroine; it is to hint at the whole ordained unreason of woman's love. For we confess it, there is the woman among us who drinks glory through the incapacity to turn on her god when he sets any look save that which she gave when he rose. The God of nature forbid that ever the others of us should misprize this sunflower love. It is the very law of the garden.

CHARLOTTE LOUISE RUDYARD.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

WORLD-POLITICS.

LONDON: ST. PETERSBURG: WASHINGTON.

LONDON, *October, 1908.*

To most Englishmen, the revelations made by Mr. Hearst in the course of the Presidential campaign have been chiefly interesting as affording another and very striking proof of the influence of money in modern politics. The perilous possibility that organized wealth may make an end of popular government is one that hovers over all democracies alike. That the United States is peculiarly exposed to it by reason of her vast material seductions, her system of electing officials for short terms, by popular vote, on low salaries, and with precarious tenures, the complexity of her scheme of State and Federal Government, and her maintenance of Protection, seems to English eyes self-evident. All the circumstances of the American polity make it easy and profitable for the corporations to take a hand in politics. From this form of corruption Great Britain is comparatively free. The temptations, for one thing, are not so strong; the system of government and of administration offers fewer weak spots to the pressure of the millionaire on the prowl; and the whole organization of British politics makes the league between the capitalist and the boss practically impossible. There is very little of a money or a money-making value attaching to political power in England, and therefore very little inducement to the big industrial companies to engage in politics. Public opinion, including the opinion of the business world itself, is strongly and effectively against the intrusion of statutory and joint-stock companies into the political committee-room. The evil of corporation subscriptions to campaign funds hardly exists.

But if from this particular abuse public life in Great Britain is well protected, at other points the power of money in politics

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

is strongly felt. In England, the present system of raising and distributing election funds involves a twofold peril. In the first place it robs the electors of some, at least, of their freedom. It gives an excessive influence to a few rich subscribers, and it enables them to nominate a candidate from motives that are concealed from the mass of the voters. In the second place, it makes it easy to apply an unwholesome pressure on the individual M.P. whose election expenses have been paid for him. It is true that so far there has been little actual ground of complaint. None the less, a system under which an increasing number of M.P.'s depend upon funds secretly subscribed and secretly disbursed for meeting their campaign expenses is one that is always liable to abuse. Another disquieting phenomenon in English politics to-day is the springing up of huge electioneering organizations, like the Tariff Reform League, formed to advocate some special measure from which its supporters will derive financial gain. These bodies raise large sums for which they render no account. They assist their favorite candidates at election with canvassers, speakers, "literature," and so on. They do for a candidate what he is absolutely unable to do for himself on such a scale. But no return of the moneys they spend is included in the statement of expenses which every candidate is required by law to furnish. In this way the purpose of the Corrupt Practices Act is in danger of being wholly frustrated. Of the cruder forms of political corruption there is, on the whole, very little in England. After the last general election, bribery, in the shape of actual purchase of votes, was only unearthed in four constituencies; but the gentler and less direct forms—indiscriminate subscriptions, for instance, on the part of an M.P. to all the charities, movements and clubs in his constituency—still flourish. Most observers, however, agree in thinking that the most harmful kind of corruption in England is not so much political as social, and that the worst of it springs from the vicious hunt for titles. It is possible for any man of wealth, by contributing to the party funds, to establish a claim for a knighthood, baronetcy or peerage that sooner or later will be recognized as valid. The type of man who enters public life as the easiest road to a title is becoming almost as common in England as he was in Ireland before the Union.

Englishmen have, indeed, before their eyes at this moment a particularly unedifying spectacle of the uses of corporate wealth

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

in politics. To the general statement that companies and industries as such do not take part in the public life of the country, there is one exception to be made. The exception, of course, is the brewing trade, the only trade which is regulated by the State and therefore the only one which stands to gain or lose by legislation and public finance. I have before now given in these pages the outlines of the Licensing Bill which the present Government has brought in and which is destined to be the main battleground during the autumn session. It has four main purposes: (1) to impose a time-limit of fourteen years, on the expiration of which all licenses will revert to the State and such of them as are reissued will be subjected to far higher duties than hitherto; (2) to reduce the present excessive numbers of licensed premises; (3) to restore to the justices their old unfettered discretion over licensed houses; (4) to give to the people in every locality a right to say whether they will have a new license in their area. Unless these purposes can be carried out, it will no longer be deniable that in England beer rules. The Government intends, if it can, to carry them out, but it is opposed by the entire resources of the trade, of the Unionist party and of the House of Lords. The trade, in particular, seems almost to have given up brewing for the sake of conducting a vast political campaign. "We are hearing much at the present time," says the "Westminster Gazette," "of the influence of Trusts upon politics in America, but do not let us forget that the trade in our own politics also, by virtue of its money power and its organization, exercises a pressure on Government which is at least comparable to that exercised by an American Trust. It does not bribe individual members of Parliament, we are thankful to say, but it has an enormous campaign fund, it powerfully influences elections and, when it chooses, can turn all its retail shops into political committee-rooms."

For the past eight months the trade has conducted an incessant and unscrupulous propaganda against the Licensing Bill, culminating on the last Sunday in September in a monster demonstration in Hyde Park. I should not care to defend the Bill in all its clauses, but on the main question the Government is undoubtedly in the right. That is to say, there must be a time-limit at the end of which the State shall resume its control over the monopoly it creates. Whether that time-limit is for fourteen

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

or twenty-one years does not greatly matter, when compared with the necessity of establishing once and for all the principle that a license is not a freehold. I do not myself believe that the Unionists in the House of Lords will venture to risk the odium of flatly rejecting the Bill, or that they will proclaim thus openly the completeness of their entanglement in the meshes of the trade. But the Government has undoubtedly a hard struggle ahead of it, even if it is only to hold sufficient ground for negotiating a compromise.

On the whole, however, the Liberals have very little complaint to make of the position in which they find themselves on the reopening of Parliament. They have been in office for nearly three years; they have passed momentous measures; they have held their majority together with unexampled success; in their colonial, their Indian and their foreign policies they have completely wiped out the legend of Liberal vacillation and light-headedness; their reforming zeal has been without precedent; and, though they are naturally weaker in the country than they were two years ago, I think that on the whole the nation is profoundly satisfied with them. Great tasks still await their energies. The Licensing Bill, the education question—at last on its way to settlement by mutual concessions—the reform of the Poor Law, the treatment of unemployment, and the reform of the electoral system, are all included in the Government's programme; and the majority of the people, in my judgment, would gladly see these measures on the Statute-Book. But trade has hardly yet begun to show even the first faint sign of recovery from the depression of the last six months; the current fiscal year seems likely to end in a deficit of nearly $20,000,000; the expenses of the old-age pensions scheme have to be met, and in addition a large increase in the naval estimates will be necessary; nobody knows quite how the money will be raised, and business and finance are consequently perturbed; and, besides the specific interests which the Government has alienated, there is a damaging suspicion in many quarters that its policy smacks of an untranslatable something called Socialism. The session, therefore, which will have opened by the time this communication is published will be anything but uneventful. On the way in which the Government weathers it we may be able to form some idea of the result of its appeal later on to the national verdict.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

ST. PETERSBURG, *October, 1908.*

CLOSE students of politics and ethics, keen observers of men and things, like De Tocqueville, hold that a successful revolution, which is destined to further the well-being of many generations, utterly demoralizes the generation that brought it to pass. How much more baleful, then, is the effect likely to be when the revolution is abortive, when, having assumed the forms of insurrection, terroism and anarchy, it has had to be crushed by the tyranny which it was created to destroy. This is the only satisfactory explanation of the lamentable fact that Russian anarchy and chaos now extend to the spiritual and ethical domains. Old enthusiasms are burnt out and religious and social faith is too weak to bear the stress of latter-day ordeals. Hence murder is rife and suicide epidemic.

The contrast between the old and the new is brought into sharper relief by the presence of one of the greatest representatives of Russian literature at its best, the realistic novelist, Count Lyoff Tolstoy, whose eightieth birthday has just been celebrated. It was celebrated in spite of the Most Holy Synod, which still regards the greatest of living Russians as a reprobate. But Tolstoy, although not a prophet in his own country, is a hero there. People know or feel that through him the name of Russia has been uttered, and uttered with admiration and gratitude throughout the globe. It was he who more clearly than any other Slav writer discerned and fixed for all time whatever is noble and good in Russian life and character. The peasant in his smoky hut and Tsar Alexander III in his palace at Gatchina contemplated with delight and profit the wondrous panorama of private and national life which he unfolded to their gaze. Alexander III was so charmed with the earlier works of the genial novelist that he resolved to treat his most distinguished subject as a sort of fellow monarch who was above the law. Tolstoy, therefore, might write or say what he would—and he occasionally hurled bitter truths at his sovereign's head—without incurring any punishment. Tolstoy, then, is the first and only Russian man of letters who enjoyed and still enjoys absolute liberty and whose complaint was not that he was deported to Siberia or thrown into prison, but that he was not exiled or put into gaol for words and deeds which were treated as crimes in others.

In Moscow and, indeed, everywhere else in Russia, the eightieth

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

anniversary of the birthday of Count Tolstoy passed off very quietly. The masses of the people knew nothing of it and cared nothing for it. Most of the daily papers came out with supplements containing biographical or critical essays, but there was no demand for them and the number of journals sold was what it had been before. Telegrams and addresses were sent to Yassnaya Polyana, where the Count resides, several citizens of Moscow visited him in person, but on the whole the celebration fell far short of the great novelist's deserts. Possibly the cholera, which had then broken out, exerted a discouraging effect on would-be pilgrims.

The sudden advent of Asiatic cholera and the utter unpreparedness of Russian society to cope with it are characteristic of the listlessness of the Slav people. Last summer it had made its way along the Volga up to Saratoff, where a considerable number of victims were carried away during my sojourn there in September. At that time and ever since every one professed to believe that it would surely reach Moscow and St. Petersburg this spring, and the press accordingly exhorted the authorities to make ready to combat it. And yet it took everybody by surprise when it came. To begin with, its appearance in the capital was kept secret for a whole fortnight, during which time nothing whatever was done to stamp it out. The medical body, which was supposed to be vigilantly watching over the health of the capital, was taken unawares. So, too, was the administration of the city. People's minds were elsewhere. The Persian revolution and the Turkish constitution were absorbing themes of interest; and people were expecting a powerful reaction in Russia, when suddenly the cholera slipped in.

The truth is that the first cases of cholera were deliberately kept secret until a number of centres of the infection were created and then the difficulty of checking the advance of the disease became apparent. The Baltic coast is now infected with cholera germs and western Europe threatened. A sanitary committee had, indeed, long ago been created for the express purpose of coping with the cholera, but the President of the Committee was away in Carlsbad taking the waters, and the guardians of the public health who ought to have warned the population that cholera was in their midst hid the fact sedulously. Hence the house in which the first case appeared was not disinfected, not even cleaned.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Other people were accordingly taken ill there, and at last the number of victims amounted to fifteen. On the Winter Palace Square is situated the Ministry of Trade and Commerce. It is in one of the healthiest districts of the capital. One of the employees, however, fell ill of cholera here and only on the following day was he conveyed to the hospital. Another employee, however, meanwhile took his place and slept in his bed the ensuing night without any precautions whatever. There had been no disinfection, no cleansing, no change of coverings, nothing for a day and a half. Yet this was in a public Ministry, a few yards distant from the Winter Palace.

Before the Asiatic scourge had come all the hospitals were crowded to such an extent that even the corridors were blocked with beds. Then nobody knew what to do with the cholera patients. There were no vehicles to transport them from the suburbs. Even in the centres of the capital patients had to wait for hours before they could be taken away. In a house in one of the principal streets the hall porter fell ill of the disease and died in convulsions. His corpse lay on the staircase for nearly a whole day, and the only measures taken were measures to keep the curious away from his body.

The ordinary hospitals had at last to be evacuated by *bona fide* patients in order to receive the cholera victims. Whole categories of sufferers are now being denied admission to hospitals altogether, and some people went so far as to propose that the insane should be expelled temporarily from their asylums so that the cholera-stricken might have places of refuge to themselves. And in spite of all this there was not accommodation enough for the ever-increasing number of cases. As the members of the Municipality had no proposals to make on the subject, the police in the person of the city prefect interfered and ordered a number of schools to be closed and turned into temporary cholera hospitals.

But in the unsanitary condition of the slums of the capital there is hardly any change. St. Petersburg has not yet got any proper system of drainage. The streets are now flushed with disinfectants, and the sickly smell of carbolic impregnates the air. Bright steaming samovars or tea-urns are carted about the highways and byways, and passers-by may ask and receive hot tea sweetened with sugar *ad libitum*. Moreover, a whole series of sanitary regulations have been drafted and published, many of

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

which are observed. After some days, however, of self-complacency on the part of the municipal authorities several cholera cases broke out in the schools. An investigation was ordered, and it was found that the state of these establishments was filthy. Who was to blame? people asked. Nobody, was the reply, for in consequence of some oversight the obligatory sanitary rules laid down for the population had not been extended to the schools!

This culpable negligence was followed by a fit of irrational zeal during which symptoms of indigestion and inebriety were mistaken for symptoms of cholera, and scores of people were seized, hurried off to the cholera barracks and subjected to the drastic treatment in vogue there. This endeavor to be on the safe side after everything conceivable had been done on the opposite side is at once amusing and characteristic. One comical instance of it deserves to be recorded. A doorkeeper of a house in one of the principal streets gulped down in a couple of hours more vodka than an average man could swallow in a day without losing his life. After that he ate a heap of dried and salted mushrooms. And then he complained of "pains inside." Half an hour later he was spirited away to the cholera hospital and "treated." In this case there was something to be said for the officials. But another man, well, strong and sober, who happened to be also a doorkeeper in the same house, was pounced upon in like manner and isolated, although in his case there were no symptoms whatever. They divested him of his clothing, gave him thin linen garments, shut him up in a damp, cold room, the floor of which was of stone, and then they left him to his own devices. Hunger, cold and the damp garments drove him wild. "It is enough to kill a healthy man," he complained. His mate, the drunkard, was kept some days in the hospital.

The cholera is now nearly over until spring, when it may break out anew. If the lesson it teaches were taken to heart one might look upon its ravages this year as a blessing in disguise. But of this there is little hope. For Russia under the new *régime* is identical with Russia under the old *régime* in almost all aspects in which a radical change was needed and hoped for. In every walk of life we are confronted with the same short-sightedness, the same optimistic Micawberism waiting confidently for something to turn up. And nowhere can one discern a rising individual of light and leading, a great organizer, a leader of man.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

WASHINGTON, *October, 1908.*

WITH the end of the Presidential campaign not far away, sagacious men, who are well acquainted with the part that money has played in close States like Indiana, where in 1880 the scale was turned by the corralling of the voters in "blocks of five," are indisposed to venture many prophecies. Some of the shrewdest Republicans in official posts at Washington—their names, for obvious reasons, cannot be mentioned—bearing in mind that this year, lacking money, their party must win solely on its merits, are inclined to think that, but for the defection from the normal Democratic vote which will be brought about by Mr. Debs (the Socialist candidate), and by Mr. Hisgen (the Hearst nominee), not a few States which are generally ranked in the Republican column might this year go Democratic. Among the Northern States which to these nervous spectators seem doubtful must be mentioned, first of all, New York, as to which we ourselves might share the doubt if we could forget the vote which Mr. Hearst has himself obtained in the past for Mayor and for Governor, and if we could forget that, even four years ago, Debs, who was much less popular than he is now, obtained nearly 37,000 votes, not one of which, apparently, was drawn from the Republican party. We confess ourselves quite unable to see how Mr. Taft can lose New York or New Jersey or Connecticut or any of the New England States. Pennsylvania, Ohio and Michigan we give him as a matter of course; also West Virginia; likewise Wisconsin, Iowa and Minnesota, though the last-named State he might have lost had Governor Johnson been the Democratic nominee for the Presidency. We take for granted, moreover, that the electoral votes of Kansas, North Dakota and Oregon will be his, and we shall be much surprised if the votes of the three States controlled by the Mormon Church, Utah, Idaho and Wyoming, are not his also. On the other hand, we think that Bryan has a chance in Delaware; that he is sure of Maryland, Kentucky, Missouri, Colorado and Montana; that he is tolerably sure this year of his own State, Nebraska, and has more than a "fighting chance" in South Dakota, Washington, Nevada and California. In the last-named State we should judge his opportunity of success to be excellent but for the large diversion from the normal Democratic vote likely to be brought about by Mr. Hearst's two newspapers printed respectively in San Francisco and Los Angeles.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

There are two Northern States of which we have not yet spoken; Indiana and Illinois. In view of the dearth of money on the Republican side, we cannot but regard the former State as in doubt. Illinois, on the other hand, seems to us quite safely Republican, because we cannot forget that Mr. Debs polled nearly 70,000 votes there four years ago, and that Mr. Hisgen (the Hearst nominee), is also certain to poll a good many. We are unable, therefore, to figure how Mr. Bryan can be elected, although we cheerfully concede that he is likely to get considerably more electoral votes than were cast for Judge Parker four years ago. In view of the prospects, as here defined, we are unable to understand why many members of the New York Stock Exchange propose to keep offices open for business purposes in the uptown district of Manhattan Borough, in order that their customers, in the event of Taft's election, may operate by cable on the London Stock Exchange. We repeat, however, that their nervousness might be justified if Mr. Hearst and his seven newspapers—he has three in New York City—had supported Mr. Bryan this year with as much vigor as they have attacked him. The net outcome of the revelations made in the personal letters read by Mr. Hearst has been incomparably more hurtful to the Democratic than to the Republican party, because the disclosures have tended to hold up the Democrats as hypocrites.

Has Mr. Taft been helped or hurt by the voluminous letters which the President has written and the effusive interviews which he has given, in favor of his Secretary of War? Upon this point in Washington opinions are divided. There are those who think that it would have been better for the Republican candidate if Mr. Roosevelt, like other Presidents, had held himself serenely aloof from a campaign in which he was not personally concerned. We are ourselves unable to take that view of the matter. Of course, Mr. Roosevelt's utterances were not needed to influence the cool-headed, sober-minded, really conservative men whose judgment of Mr. Taft's fitness for the Chief Magistracy is based upon the tests to which his ability and character have been subjected in the course of a long, varied and difficult administrative career. The rank and file of the electorate, however, know nothing and care nothing about Cuba, Porto Rico, the Philippines or the administration of the War Office, except so far as demands are made upon the Treasury. The intelligent and thoughtful men who

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

are qualified to judge Mr. Taft by what he has accomplished in executive office are few. In the eyes of the mass of the voters, Mr. Taft's principal asset is the belief that he will carry out Mr. Roosevelt's policies; and, when they are in doubt upon this point, there is only one man in the world who can reassure them, and that is Theodore Roosevelt himself. If Mr. Taft is successful, our own notion is that he will owe his success primarily to the incessant exercise of energy with which Mr. Roosevelt has held the bulk of the proletariat to the support of the Republican candidate; and, secondarily, to the destructive work done in the Democratic ranks by Mr. Debs and Mr. Hearst. If we do not add Mr. Watson, it is because he can only injure Mr. Bryan in Southern States, which in no event would give their electoral votes to a Republican.

It will be recalled that last year Congress refused to provide funds for laying down in the current twelvemonth more than two first-class battleships. Since that time several ominous events have taken place. In the first place, the German Reichstag voted to appropriate the money needed to lay down four Dreadnoughts annually for four years to come. In the second place, the action of Austria in tearing up the Berlin Treaty has made it evident to the man in the street that Peace Congresses, which, at best, can only eventuate in treaties, represent a ridiculous waste of time. If even treaties are less binding to-day than they were a hundred or even two hundred years ago, how farcical is the talk about a reduction of military and naval armaments! There is no substitute for armaments but treaties, and, if treaties are worthless, the sooner nations increase their power of self-defence, the better. England has taken the dismal lesson to heart, and her Cabinet has agreed that, beginning this year, she shall lay down no fewer than eight Dreadnoughts, or super-Dreadnoughts, annually, for at least four years, a decision which, of course, would give her thirty-two additional Dreadnoughts at no distant day. This decision will have tremendous consequences. In the first place, France, which has no desire to increase her own navy, will drift more and more into a position of absolute dependence upon Great Britain. In the second place, Germany, which already found itself confronted with the necessity of borrowing $550,000,000 in order to carry out its four-Dreadnought programme, will recognize the absolute futility of competing with Great Britain for the

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

supremacy of the sea. For the United States, however, which have immense naval responsibilities on the Pacific as well as the Atlantic, the new naval programme of Great Britain has a different admonition. It evidently behooves us to make our navy at least as strong as that of Germany, which, for her part, has but little to do besides defending her North Sea and Baltic coasts. We are not surprised to hear that the change in the international situation has converted Senator Lodge from a "moderate navy" into a "big navy" advocate.

Most Americans seem to take for granted that the United States are not concerned in the extraordinary events which have taken place in Southeastern Europe during the last few weeks. It is true enough that it matters not the least to us whether the former Turkish provinces of Bosnia and Herzegovina become integral parts of the Hapsburg realm; whether Bulgaria becomes absolutely independent or remains simply autonomous; whether Servia must renounce her age-long aspirations to develop, finally, into a greater Servian Empire; whether Montenegro does or does not secure absolute control of her one seaport, Antivari; and whether autonomous Crete does or does not effect complete political union with the Kingdom of Greece. Those matters are to us indifferent. Suppose, however, that a European Congress should decide, as it may, that Turkey, which, on the face of things, is the victim of all these changes, deserves some compensation, and that this should not take exclusively a pecuniary form, but should include an agreement on the part of the great Powers to treat Turkey at least as well as they have already treated Japan, and, to that end, relieve her from the so-called capitularies, or extra-territorial régime that gives foreigners a right to be tried by consular courts instead of by native tribunals, which, the galling implication is, are not trustworthy. Now, as things are, American citizens residing or sojourning in Turkey have a treaty right to be tried, not by native tribunals, but in courts presided over by their own consuls. That right cannot be anulled arbitrarily; the treaty conferring it cannot be abrogated by a European Congress to which the United States is not a party. That is why, if the coming Congress contemplates touching the capitularies, it must invite the United States to participate in its deliberations, so far as that particular matter is concerned.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

THE EDITOR'S DIARY.

A Reply to a Lady.

THE following communication, of which a copy reached us simultaneously, appeared in a sprightly public journal of this city:

"*To the Editor of 'The Evening Sun':*

"SIR,—Colonel Harvey's article indirectly attacking the equal-rights movement can do little harm to that cause, but the harm that it can accomplish, if accepted literally, from a religious and moral standpoint is incalculable. Under pain of giving grave scandal, but for purposes of refutation, we quote as follows:

"'Wiser ones doubtless appreciate the extent of the immunity which they now enjoy, and they may well hesitate for a long time to forsake, for mere temporary advantages, a position likely to prove so serviceable in the hereafter. Whether feminine opposition to the attempt to establish equal rights on earth is based, in part, upon intelligent realization of the accompanying necessity of waiving this precious privilege we cannot say; but it is clear that no woman should be permitted through ignorance or misapprehension to adopt a course which tends to her undying regret in the world to come.

"'The fact, of course, is that women are not only not bound by, but are freed, at least by inference, from any obligation to observe the requirements of our fundamental religious laws. The Ten Commandments were written for men and apply to men exclusively.'

"This reduced to lowest terms seems to imply that license is granted to women to commit any sin they may desire without jeoparding their right to eternal happiness, provided they do not commit the sin of desiring to vote.

"Colonel Harvey doesn't supply any eminent authorities to support this statement, giving as his reasons the use of the masculine gender: 'Thou shalt not covet thy neighbor's wife, etc.' No prophet, poet, theologian or historian who has described in detail the torments inflicted in the world to come on those who failed to observe the Commandments has seen fit to exclude women, and of the many eminent ladies mentioned in these annals none was charged with being suffragists.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

"If, as the editor states, the Commandments were written for men, it is a well-known fact that a majority of their observers are women. That is to say, a greater number of women keep a greater number of the Commandments than men do, and we all know that if all the Commandments were rigidly observed by every man and woman on the earth the Kingdom of God would be close at hand. Even if Colonel Harvey's contention held true, that all unfranchised women were freed from moral responsibility, would not that be sufficient reason to marshal every woman (that we cared to speak to) into the ranks of the responsible and respectable, or, in other words, the suffragists?

"It is a notable fact that all the leaders of this cause were and are exemplary Christians, so that the seductive blandishment of this article can have little weight with them. It is only fair to assume that people who are so capable of providing for themselves in the world to come should have a little more voice in making the laws that provide for material sustenance in this world. There is nothing in the Commandments against any one making himself or herself as comfortable as possible in the interval that must necessarily elapse before one can enter into the joys of eternal life, and one of the best means of supplying this comfort would be to possess a vote in the councils that manipulate the distribution of the wealth of the world.

"We sincerely hope that women in general, and the editor's female relatives in particular, will not feel disposed to take advantage of his false theology. The divorce courts are at present working overtime, and 'certain specified acts' covered by the Seventh Commandment are still far too common to be flippantly commended by any teacher or preacher (an editor of Colonel Harvey's standing ought to be both) possessing even the semblance of a conscience.

"SARA MCPIKE.

"NEW YORK, *September 17.*"

If the Lord had seen fit to create our correspondent in the image of Adam instead of in resemblance to Eve, thus enabling us to treat her from the plane of equality rather than of the courtesy prescribed by modern custom, we should endeavor frankly to impress upon her the advisability of so training her mind as to enable it to resist the beclouding effect of casual misapprehensions.

Because, in behalf of the cause of unsexed suffrage, we considered it to be our duty to warn women that they could not reasonably expect to be endowed with unlimited political rights unless they should manifest a disposition to accept full moral responsibility, not as yet imposed upon them by our fundamental religious law, it by no means follows that we regard the desire to vote as "a sin." On the contrary, it is an aspiration of the

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

highest order, the realization of which, as ever in like cases, must involve the penalty of severe deprivation—in this instance, of loss of immunity from punishment for infractions of the Commandments.

Because, too, none of the prophets, poets, thelogians and historians who have "described in detail the torments inflicted in the world to come" may have excluded women serves only to emphasize the fact that none really did include them, thus clearly confirming our position in the minds of those who, unlike ourselves, attach more importance to the torments anticipated in the hereafter than the sufferings necessarily, though regretfully, endured in the here. Of the "eminent ladies mentioned in these annals," none of whom was regarded as a suffragist, we are disqualified to speak, since we are unable to descry either the annals or the eminent ladies to which and to whom attention is called. Whether "a majority of observers" of the Commandments are women is necessarily a matter of opinion, since statistics convey no information upon the subject sufficiently accurate to convince a mind accustomed to base its conclusions upon the results of scientific inquiry. We are unable, moreover, to understand why, "if all the Commandments were observed by every man and woman, the Kingdom of God" would not be here, instead of only "close at hand." The admission that general acceptance of our "contention," *i.e.*, truism, would promptly marshal all respectable women into the ranks of the suffragists we cannot but regard as unwarrantably complimentary, and yet as indubitable testimony from an unwilling witness to the sincerity of our devotion to the cause.

We can understand the advisability of excluding from the Kingdom of God women whom "we"—meaning our correspondent and her acquaintances—do not "care to speak to," but why so stern a refusal to converse or even merely nod? Are not all women sinners, or, using a milder term, perhaps, human? Are we to assume that those who are most human are the ones to whom the least human feel warranted in refusing recognition? If so, we can now appreciate our correspondent's real meaning when she referred to the Kingdom of God as something which might be "close at hand" but never here. Upon what grounds our correspondent bases her confident assertion that a segregated group of women is "capable of [selfishly] providing for them-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

selves [alone] in the world to come," is not apparent. Nor is it quite clear that none of the comforts closely related to "material substances in this world" need be forfeited through strict observance of the Commandments before—of course—"entering into the joys of eternal life." Indeed, if our correspondent will look closely at the Fourth Commandment, she will perceive readily that she would receive no "material sustenance" whatever on the Sabbath Day under her interpretation of that law, neither she nor her manservant nor her maidservant nor her stranger within her gates; whereas, under her unconscious application of our rendering we dare think it probable that she fares very well.

We shall pass gently, and without chiding, the somewhat personal remarks ventured by our correspondent in her closing paragraphs, hesitating for only an instant to inform her that we make it a rule never to afford gratification to spinsters by discussing with them the Seventh Commandment.

The Progress of Esperanto.

FOR the information of the two thousand members of THE NORTH AMERICAN REVIEW Esperanto Association, we take the liberty of printing the following communication addressed to the editor of this REVIEW by Mr. Edwin C. Reed, Secretary of the Esperanto Association of North America:

"SIR,—According to the vote of the Council, you were unanimously elected president of the Esperanto Association of North America, and I am glad that it is my duty to notify you of this decision, since at Chautauqua I sent the first communication to you.

"We sincerely hope that this union of forces will work to the upbuilding of the association and the general cause of Esperanto in America.

"I am, sir,

"EDWIN C. REED, *Secretary.*

"CHICAGO, ILLINOIS, *October 8, 1908.*"

As our readers have been made aware, the International Esperanto Congress at Dresden in August was notably successful. We hope soon to present the conclusions of Major Paul F. Straub, of the United States Army, the official representative of our Government at the Congress.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

LA SENTENCOJ DE SALOMONO.*

(El la Biblio.)

EL LA ORIGINALO TRADUKIS, L. L. ZAMENHOF.

ĈAPITRO XXVI.

(1) Kiel neĝo en somero kaj kiel pluvo en tempo de rikolto, tiel ne konvenas honoro por malsaĝulo. (2) Kiel birdo forleviĝas, kiel hirundo forflugas, tiel senkaŭza malbeno ne efektiviĝas. (3) Vipo estas por ĉevalo, brido por azeno, kaj bastono por la dorso de malsaĝuloj. (4) Ne respondu al malsaĝulo laŭ lia malsaĝeco, por ke vi mem ne fariĝu egala al li. (5) Respondu al malsaĝulo laŭ lia malsaĝeco, por ke li ne estu saĝulo en siaj propraj okuloj. (6) Kiu komisias aferon al malsaĝulo, tiu trancas al si la piedojn kaj sin suferigas; (7) liaj femuroj estas malpli fortaj ol ĉe lamulo, kaj li fariĝas instrua ekzemplo en la buŝo de malsaĝuloj. (8) Kiel iu, kiu alligas ŝtonon al ĵetilo, tiel estas tiu, kiu faras honoron al malsaĝulo. (9) Kiel dorna kano en la mano de ebriulo, tiel estas sentenco en la buŝo de malsaĝuloj. (10) Kompetentulo ĉion bone faras; sed kiu luas pasantojn, tiu luas malsaĝulojn. (11) Kiel hundo revenas al sia vomitaĵo, tiel malsaĝulo ripetas sian malsaĝaĵon. (12) Se vi vidas homon, kiu estas saĝa en siaj okuloj,—malsaĝulo povas pli esperi ol li. (13) Maldiligentulo diras: "Leono estas sur la vojo, leono estas sur la stratoj." (14) Pordo turniĝas sur sia hoko kaj maldiligentulo sur sia lito. (15) Maldiligentulo ŝovas sian manon en la poton kaj ne volas venigi ĝin al sia buŝo. (16) Maldiligentulo estas

* Dr. Zamenhof has made this translation of Proverbs from the original text especially for THE NORTH AMERICAN REVIEW. The first chapter appeared in the December, 1907, issue. The subsequent chapters will be published during 1908.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

en siaj okuloj pli saĝa, ol sep veraj saĝuloj. (17) Pasanto, kiu sin miksas en malpropran disputon, estas kiel iu, kiu kaptas hundon je la oreloj. (18) Kiel serĉanto, kiu ĵetas fajron, sagojn kaj morton, (19) tiel estas homo, kiu trompas sian proksimulon kaj diras: "Mi ja ŝercas." (20) Kie ne estas ligno, estingiĝas la fajro, kaj se ne estas kalumnianto, ĉesiĝas malpaco. (21) Karbo servas por ardaĵo, ligno por fajro, kaj homo malpacema por kaŭzi malpacon. (22) La vortoj de kalumnianto estas kiel sorĉo, kaj ili penetras en la profundon de la koro. (23) Varmegaj lipoj kun malica koro estas nepurigita arĝento, kiu kovras argilaĵon. (24) Malamiko havas maskitajn parolojn, kaj en sia koro li preparas malicon. (25) Kiam li ĉarmigas sian voĉon, ne kredu al li, ĉar sep abomenaĵoj estas en lia koro. (26) Kiu trompe kaŝas malamon, tiu aperigos sian malbonecon en popola kunveno. (27) Kiu fosas foson, tiu falos en ĝin, kaj kiu rulas ŝtonon, al tiu ĝi revenos. (28) Mensogema lango malamas siajn riproĉantojn, kaj hipokrita buŝo kaŭzas pereon.

ĈAPITRO XXVII.

(1) Ne fanfaronu pri la morgaŭa tago, ĉar vi ne scias, kion naskos la tago. (2) Alia vin laŭdu, sed ne via buŝo, fremdulo, sed ne viaj lipoj. (3) Peza estas ŝtono, kaj sablo estas ŝarĝo, sed kolero de malsaĝulo estas pli peza ol ambaŭ. (4) Kolero estas kruelaĵo, kaj furiozo estas superakvego, sed kiu sin tenos kontraŭ envio? (5) Pli bona estas riproĉo nekaŝita, ol amo kaŝita. (6) Fidelkoraj estas la batoj de amanto, sed tro multaj estas la kisoj de malamanto. (7) Sata animo malŝatas dolĉan sukon, sed por malsata animo ĉio maldolĉa estas dolĉa. (8) Kiel birdo, kiu forlasis sian neston, tiel estas homo, kiu forlasis sian lokon. (9) Oleo kaj odorfumaĵo ĝojigas la koron, sed dolĉa parolo de amiko estas pli bona ol bonodora arbo. (10) Ne forlasu vian amikon kaj la amikon de via patro, kaj en la domon de via frato ne iru en la tago de via mizero; pli bona estas najbaro proksima ol frato malproksima. (11) Estu saĝa, mia filo, kaj ĝojigu mian koron, kaj mi havos kion respondi al mia insultanto. (12) Prudentulo antaŭvidas malfeliĉon kaj kaŝiĝas, sed malsaĝuloj iras kaj difektiĝas. (13) Prenu lian veston, ĉar li garantiis por aliulo, kaj pro fremduloj prenu de li garantiaĵon. (14) Kiu frue matane benas sian proksimulon per laŭta voĉo, tiu estos opiniata malbenanto. (15) Defluilo en pluva tago kaj

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

malpacema edzino estas egalaj. (16) Kiu ŝin retenas, tiu retenas venton kaj volas kapti oleon per sia dekstra mano. (17) Fero akriĝas per fero, kaj homon akrigas la rigardo de lia proksimulo. (18) Kiu gardas figarbon, tiu manĝos ĝiajn fruktojn, kaj kiu gardas sian sinjoron, tiu estos honorata. (19) Kiel en la akvo vizaĝo speguliĝas al vizaĝo, tiel la koro de homo estas kontraŭ alia koro. (20) Infero kaj abismo neniam satiĝas, kaj ankaŭ la okuloj de homo neniam satiĝas. (21) Kiel fandujo por arĝento kaj forno por oro, tiel estas por homo la buŝo de lia laŭdanto. (22) Se vi pistos malsaĝulon en pistujo inter griaĵo, lia malsaĝeco de li ne apartiĝos. (23) Bone konu viajn ŝafojn atentu viajn brutarojn. (24) Ĉar riĉeco ne daŭras eterne, kaj krono ne restas por ĉiuj generacioj. (25) Aperas herbo, montriĝas verdaĵo, kaj kolektiĝas kreskaĵoj de la montoj. (26) Ŝafoj estas, por vesti vin, kaj kaproj, por doni al vi la eblon aĉeti kampon. (27) Estas sufiĉe da kaprina lakto, por nutri vin, por nutri vian domon kaj por subteni la vivon de viaj servantinoj.

ĈAPITRO XXVIII.

(1) MALVIRTULO kuras, kiam neniu persekutas, sed virtuloj estas sentimaj, kiel leono. (2) Kiam lando pekas, ĝi havas multe da estroj; sed se regas homo prudenta kaj kompetenta, li regas longe. (3) Homo malriĉa, kiu premas malriĉulojn, estas kiel pluvo batanta, sed ne donanta panon. (4) Kiuj forlasis la leĝojn, tiuj laŭdas malvirtulon, sed la observantoj de la leĝoj indignas kontraŭ li. (5) Malbonaj homoj ne komprenas justecon, sed la serĉantoj de Dio komprenas ĉion. (6) Pli bona estas malriĉulo, kiu iras en sia senkulpeco, ol homo, kiu iras malĝustan vojon, kvankam li estas riĉa. (7) Kiu observas la leĝojn, estas filo prudenta, sed kunulo de malĉastuloj hontigas sian patron. (8) Kiu pligrandigas sian havon per procentegoj kaj troprenado, tiu kolektas ĝin por kompatanto de malriĉuloj. (9) Kiu forklinas sian orelon de aŭdado de instruo, ties eĉ preĝo estas abomenaĵo. (10) Kiu forlogas virtulojn al vojo malbona, tiu mem falos en sian foson, sed la senkulpuloj heredos bonon. (11) Riĉulo estas saĝa en siaj okuloj, sed saĝa malriĉulo lin tute travidas. (12) Kiam triumfas virtuloj, estas granda gloro, sed kiam altiĝas malvirtuloj, tiam homoj kaŝiĝas. (13) Kiu kaŝas siajn pekojn, tiu ne estos feliĉa, sed kiu ilin konfesas kaj forlasas, tiu estos pardonita. (14) Bone estas al homo, kiu ĉiam timas, sed kiu

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

havas malmolan koron, tiu falos en malfeliĉon. (15) Leono krieganta kaj urso avida estas malvirta reganto super malriĉa popolo. (16) Se reganto estas neprudenta, tiam fariĝas multe da maljustaĵoj; sed kiu malamas profiton, tiu longe vivos. (17) Homo, kies konscienco estas ŝarĝita de mortigo, kuros al foso, kaj oni lin ne haltigu. (18) Kiu iras en senpekeco, tiu estos savita, sed kiu iras malvirtan vojon, tiu subite falos. (19) Kiu prilaboras sian teron, tiu havos sate da pano; sed kiu sekvas vantaĵojn, tiu havos plenan malriĉecon. (20) Homon fidelan oni multe benas, sed kiu rapidas riĉiĝi, tiu ne restos sen puno. (21) Konsideri personon jn ne estas bone; pro peco da pano homo pekus. (22) Homo enviema rapidas al riĉeco, kaj li ne scias, ke malriĉeco lin atendas. (23) Kiu faras riproĉojn al homo, tiu poste trovos pli da danko, ol tiu, kiu flatas per la lango. (24) Kiu rabas de sia patro kaj patrino kaj diras "ĝi ne estas peko," tiu estas kamarado de mortigisto. (25) Fierulo kaŭzas malpacojn, sed kiu fidas Dion, tiu estos bonstata. (26) Kiu fidas sin mem, tiu estas malsaĝa, sed kiu tenas sin prudente, tiu estos savita. (27) Kiu donas al malriĉulo, tiu ne havos mankon; sed kiu kovras siajn okulojn, tiu estas multe malbenata. (28) Kiam malvirtuloj altiĝas, homoj kaŝiĝas, sed kiam ili pereas, tiam multiĝas virtuloj.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

CONTRIBUTORS TO THIS NUMBER.

H. C. Lodge,

one of the most cultured and scholarly of American statesmen, has long held a large place in the esteem of his countrymen. He was editor of The North American Review from 1873 to 1876, and in the latter year he was appointed University Lecturer on American History at Harvard, a position which he held for three years. In 1886 he was elected a member of the House of Representatives, and during the years in which he served his constituency in that capacity he exhibited such marked ability in representing their interests, and in dealing with the greater questions of national concern which came up for consideration in the lower house of Congress, that in 1893 he was transferred to the United States Senate, in whose deliberations he has ever since taken a commanding part. Senator Lodge has been a life-long student of American history. Among the works which have resulted from his investigations in this field may be mentioned "A Short History of the English Colonies in America," "The Story of the American Revolution," "Hero Tales from American History," and, in the "American Statesmen Series," the lives of Daniel Webster, Alexander Hamilton and George Washington.

Peter S. Grosscup,

Judge of the United States Circuit Court of Appeals since 1899, was born in Ashland, Ohio, in 1852, and educated in Wittenberg College and the Boston Law School. For a number of years he practised law in his native town and in Chicago. In 1892 he was appointed United States Judge for the northern district of Illinois. During his occupancy of

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

the bench, Judge Grosscup has rendered decisions in various important cases which have attracted the widest attention, the latest being the reversal of a judgment imposing a large fine upon the Standard Oil Company.

BRITANNICUS

is a well-known English writer, who for many years has made a close and comprehensive study of international politics, and of the questions which arise out of, or affect, the relations between the great European Powers.

SVETOZAR TONJOROFF,

a Bulgarian by birth, was educated at Phillips Exeter Academy and at Harvard University. He has done editorial work for newspapers in Boston and New York since 1894, and is now connected with the editorial staff of the "Daily Journal" of Providence, Rhode Island. He has contributed articles on European politics to various publications.

AUGUSTUS D. SMALL

is a graduate of Colby College, Waterville, Maine. He has long been engaged in educational work. During his last two college terms he was temporary Principal of Coburn Classical Institute. He was successively Principal of the High Schools at Rockland, Maine, and at Newport, Rhode Island; a member of the Rhode Island Board of Education; Superintendent of Schools in Newport, Rhode Island and Salem, Massachusetts. He was sub-master of the Lawrence Grammar School in South Boston, and he has been head-master of the South Boston High School since its organization in 1901.

JOHN HARSEN RHOADES

graduated from Harvard University in 1892. He is the head of the New York banking firm of Messrs. Rhoades & Company. His interest in savings-banks and subjects related to them has been life-long, his grandfather, E. F. Wheelright, and his father, the late John Harsen Rhoades, having been presidents of the Greenwich Savings-Bank of New York City for many years. Mr. Rhoades himself is a trustee of the Greenwich Savings-Bank.

COMMANDER ROY C. SMITH, U.S.N.,

has written several articles for the REVIEW. He has served at sea on the various Stations, was aboard the battleship "Indiana" at Santiago, and has lately commanded the

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

cruiser "Chattanooga" on the China Station. His shore duty has comprised the Naval Academy, the Torpedo Station, Lectures at Harvard, service as Naval Attaché at Paris and St. Petersburg, and at present the Naval War College. He is a gold-medallist of the United States Naval Institute, and he has been decorated by the French Government in the Legion of Honor.

JOHN DANIELS

is a graduate of Harvard University. As holder of the Harvard Fellowship at the South End House, he has been making a study for several years of the situation of the negro in Boston. He is corresponding secretary of the Congo Reform Association, and secretary of the American branch of the recently created International League for the Defence of the Natives in the Conventional Basin of the Congo. He is the author of a recently published work entitled "An Outline of Economics."

MARY CHILD

is an English lady who has devoted herself to the study of old English literature, on which she has written a number of articles.

THE REV. P. GAVAN DUFFY,

who comes of a long ecclesiastical line, was born of Irish parents in an English vicarage. He was educated at St. Mary's College, London, and Pocoke College in Ireland. His health broke down while he was studying for Holy Orders and he was advised to seek recuperation in America. He spent about two years in the region of the Rocky Mountains, and, while he was on the point of returning to England, he was persuaded to accept the rectorship of the Episcopal Cathedral of Kansas City, a position which he occupied for some time. He has held several preferments in different parts of the country, and he is now rector of the Episcopal Church in Vergennes, Vermont.

STEPHEN W. NICKERSON

is a member of the Bar of the Federal Courts, and of the Massachusetts and Rhode Island Bars. He is a native of Boston and a graduate of Brown University. He is the author of a "History of the Bank of England" and of a pamphlet on "The Law of Money." He was appointed Honorary Vice-Consul for China at Boston in 1902, and

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

promoted to be Consul in March, 1905, before his three years' term as vice-consul expired. In the autumn of 1906, he went to China, where he remained some time and visited most of the treaty ports and Peking, being received with flattering honors by officials of the Chinese Government and by Chinese merchants.

CLARENCE H. GAINES

was graduated from St. Lawrence University in 1900, after which he spent two years in post-graduate work, specializing in English literature. In 1902 he accepted a position in the literary department of the Lothrop Publishing Company of Boston, and since the failure of that firm, in 1904, he has devoted himself to literary work in New York.

LOUISE COLLIER WILLCOX

was born in Chicago. She is the daughter of a Unitarian minister, and was educated in France, Germany and England. Later, she studied for two years at the Conservatory of Leipzig, and for two years in Birmingham, England. She has lived in Virginia since 1887, and has been a contributor to "East and West," "The Chap-Book," "The Century," "The Outlook," "Poet-Lore," "The Times-Democrat" of New Orleans, "The Boston Transcript" and "The Evening Post" of New York. For several years she has been a reader and adviser of one of the leading publishing houses, and has regularly contributed editorials to "Harper's Weekly."

LAWRENCE GILMAN,

who has been a frequent contributor to the REVIEW upon musical and literary subjects, has been music critic of "Harper's Weekly" since 1901. Among his books are "Phases of Modern Music," "The Music of To-morrow," "Stories of Symphonic Music" and analytical guides to Richard Strauss's opera "Salome" and Claude Debussy's "Pelléas et Mélisande."

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED